The Forum

SEPTEMBER, 1894.

THE LESSONS OF RECENT CIVIL DISORDERS.[1]

THE year that has elapsed since the last meeting of the Association is in some very striking particulars one of the most notable in the history of the country, and it may be well to call attention to some of the phases of its social and public life, which in a constitutional point of view appear to merit notice. They have a bearing upon the vital principles of our political institutions, and seem to indicate a necessity for reviewing the work of those whom we have been accustomed to admire and respect as the founders of liberty in the western world, and for considering and judging for ourselves whether the structure they created, and which has hitherto been the admiration of the world, is worthy of the praise it has received. The question is stated with some hesitation, because it seems presumptuous for a citizen of a country whose political institutions have been so greatly praised to seem to admit by action or suggestion that the fundamental principles of American liberty can be in need of his championship, so self-evident has their excellence appeared, and so important to the happiness and well-being of any people who have learned to consider liberty an unquestionable blessing. But the experience of the year has taught us, if we needed the lesson, that times may and will come when the fact that for a century political institutions have had beneficent operation, and the excellence of their principles has seemed unquestionable to those who have enjoyed them, may perhaps no longer be accepted as conclusive evidence of

[1] From the Presidential address before the National Bar Association.

Copyright, 1893, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their consistency with true liberty or with the highest good of a free people.

When such a time comes, the most fundamental principles may be in need, not merely of tacit acceptance, but of a defence that shall consist in active and aggressive warfare upon those who in disorderly or unconstitutional ways assail them. We should at all times have in mind the great truth that the customary laws and even the fundamental institutions of any country are moulded and modified by the everyday life and thought of the people, and that sometimes even the carelessly tolerated disregard of existing law, and of constitutional principles, which no one would directly propose to change, may tend in the same direction.

I wish to call attention to an obligation resting upon members of the legal profession, and which I think goes quite beyond that which under the same state of facts would rest upon citizens in general. When, as we have lately seen, so-called "industrial armies" dissolve into roving vagabonds and beggars, the absurdity of their claims and pretences makes them the subject of contempt and ridicule; but if their mischievous doctrines have taken root among any class of our people, and their demoralizing raids upon the industry of the country are likely to be repeated by themselves or by others, it is not by a thoughtless and contemptuous word that the mention of them can be wisely dismissed. Especially is this the case as regards the members of the legal profession, for a special duty rests upon them to give active and effective aid to established institutions whenever revolutionary doctrines are brought forward, or when the fundamental rights we had supposed were made secure under constitutional guarantees are invaded or appear to be put in peril. It is a low and very unworthy view any lawyer takes of his office, when he assumes that he has nothing to do with public ignorance of the duty of subordination to the institutions of organized society, or with breaches of law existing or threatened, except as he may be called upon to prosecute or defend in the courts for a compensation to be paid him.

The past year has been especially prolific in acts of violence against individuals charged with crime of a particularly horrifying character, or who had made themselves particularly obnoxious or repulsive to their neighbors, or to some specially influential or numerous class of the community. Until recently it has been assumed by some that only one section of the country was justly subject to the reproach that its public sentiment tolerated the infliction of punishment by lawless

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

force, and that even in that section it was mostly limited to one very gross class of offences. But no one section can any longer reproach another in this particular: lynchings have recently been numerous north and south and west, and in cases where murder and sometimes only a violation of property rights was charged, as well as in gross cases of outrage upon women. Their alarming feature is that in very many cases there was no attempt at concealment, and no pretence that violence was necessary to prevent justice being cheated of its dues; they took place sometimes when legal process had already been invoked against the criminal and was leading to certain punishment; and the participants in the lawless tragedy in some cases could openly boast that those who were accounted the best citizens in the community approved the deed, and would not suffer the actors therein to be punished.

I have spoken of lynching as an offence against the life or liberty of a citizen, as commonly it is; but I desire to emphasize the fact that the extent to which the lawless restraint of personal liberty may go is less important than the public sentiment which tolerates any invasion whatsoever. Recently a man was hanged in one State as a supposed murderer; in another a State officer was publicly tarred and feathered for actions which the persons assaulting him considered inadmissible to one in his position; and in still another a delegate to a political convention was dressed in petticoats and publicly exposed to ridicule because the local community was not pleased with a vote he had cast on a question of suffrage. In the degree of wrong to the individual there was difference in the three cases, but the lawlessness, the disregard of the obligations of citizenship, and the injury to organized society were equally plain in all, and equally deserving of unqualified condemnation. It may be safely assumed that in not one of the communities in which these criminal disorders took place are life, liberty, and property—which our written constitutions undertake to protect—so secure and so jealously guarded as they were before. But the mischiefs, though greatest in localities, are by no means restricted to them, but affect in a measure the whole country.

A little while ago we were horrified by the announcement that the President of the French Republic, a man highly esteemed the world over, and a true friend of liberty, had been assassinated by an anarchist. The assassin, as an individual, had no grievance whatever to allege against his victim; he was not even pretending to redress a wrong; he was complaining of no violation, by his distinguished vic-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tim, of the liberty of himself or of any other person. He was simply an anarchist, and the man he murdered was the representative of law and settled institutions,—free and just institutions, established by and for the people themselves. But the anarchist will have no settled institutions whatever; he will have chaos.

Now, we have anarchists in our own country; they submit to no government if they can escape it, even if to that end they must make use of the dagger, the bomb, or the torch; and they openly applauded this murder. They have gathering-places where by frantic appeals to passion and prejudice they seek to make converts to their doctrines; and when anything occurs to excite other classes to a temporary disregard of law, they are ever ready and willing to swell the ranks of discontent, and to give destructive effect, so far at least as they may with safety do so, to their hatred of government, not hesitating in some cases to take great personal risks.

We justly look upon these men as foes to the human race, for their doctrines, if given full effect, would plunge us into a condition of worse savagery than history shows to have heretofore existed. We have no knowledge that any nation or tribe, even in the earliest ages, has been absolutely without governmental authority which could impose restraint upon the passions of those subject to it, and give some protection to the community against the lawless conduct of individuals. The anarchist, if he could have his way, would be under no such subjection; his ideal society would be without law; and the freedom he seeks is like the freedom which prevails among the beasts of prey in African deserts or the jungles of India. A people would not simply give up their civilization by accepting his doctrines; they would give up such restraints upon the human passions as are found even among savages.

Every American-born citizen regards these people with horror, and so does every man among us who has come from foreign lands with any respect whatever for free institutions, or even for law. When, therefore, their sentiments are openly avowed, we have very little occasion to fear them. But we are not infrequently reminded, when an act of tolerated mob violence takes place, that a community may have an abhorrence of anarchy and yet so conduct themselves when they see the law openly and publicly set at defiance that the respect for it which should be its chief support will become more nominal than real, and perhaps be replaced by disregard and contempt. If they look on with unconcern while such an act is taking

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

place, if they give no aid when steps are being taken for the punishment of the participants, a condition of public insensibility to this class of offences is likely to be brought about, the result of which is that whenever the community is excited, and therefore specially in need of legal restraint, the law is found to be powerless.

If every citizen who thus countenances or refuses to aid in repressing crimes of this nature would consider a little what must be the natural consequence of his action or of his failure to act, he might perhaps come to appreciate the serious nature of his fault, and to understand how little he would himself deserve the protection of the law if some mob should select him as a victim of lawless violence. He would have the conviction forced upon him that by his course he is teaching disregard of law; that the act he aids or excuses is one step in the direction of the chaos the anarchist would establish; that his example in countenancing disorder is aiding to create a public sentiment which may by and by tolerate and protect the lynching of any person whomsoever for any act bad or good which happens to arouse public animosity, or even for no other reason than that the obnoxious person has in worldly pursuits been more successful than those about him. He will perhaps reflect also that when the disorder which he countenances in a single instance becomes general, it will not be the vagabond or the beggar that lawless classes will select for victims, but the man who for any reason is important and prominent in the community.

During the summer just past, the country has witnessed a great and disastrous boycott and strike of railroad workmen. The cause was not any controversy over their own wages or their treatment by their employers; it was a "sympathetic" movement, so called, and the reason assigned was that laborers for a corporation with which some of the railroad companies had important dealings had gone upon strike.

It began with a boycott against railroad companies who made use of the cars of the corporation aimed at, and who did not discontinue their use; this being followed by a general strike, the avowed purpose of which was, by blocking the wheels of traffic, to coerce the railroad companies into taking such action as would compel the corporation complained of to submit to arbitration the charges of oppression which its employees brought against it. The strike was professedly peaceful, and the thought in the minds of the leaders appeared to be that by the men leaving the railroad service and enforcing a boycott as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to such of the railroad companies as had dealings with the offending corporation, all the companies would be so completely crippled that they could no longer run their trains, and must of necessity accept the terms dictated to them.

The case was in some particulars without precedent. Its leading peculiarities were the following:

1. The railroad companies had no means of coercing the offending corporation to submit to arbitration the controversy with its workmen; they could at most only refuse to carry out certain existing contracts with it, and discriminate against it when called upon to act for it as common carriers; but either of these acts would be unlawful, and must subject them to damages and to the compulsory process of the courts. The companies struck at were therefore required to put themselves in distinct opposition not only to certain contract obligations before entered into by them, and perfectly legal when made, but to the law itself, so that, by yielding, they would naturally expect legal penalties to follow. But refusal to submit must inevitably result in great loss to the companies, for their receipts would be largely reduced, since the commerce of the country, in so far as it was in their charge, would be paralyzed in exact proportion as the strike succeeded in its aims. Meantime the offending corporation would be comparatively unharmed,—perhaps not harmed at all.

2. But, if the strike was intended to be a peaceful one, it was soon seen that the burden of the loss was to fall, not upon the railroad companies, but upon the public who had occasion to use their services. This would be, as was soon shown, a necessary result of the stoppage of railroad trains. Great numbers of passengers were side-tracked at way-stations, at some of which it was with difficulty they procured the means of subsistence; shippers of property were put to great loss by delays; and immense quantities of perishable freight were soon going to ruin on trains which the railroad managers were unable to take to their destination. California and tropical fruit by the train-load, dressed meats in similar quantities, even live cattle and horses, all belonging to private parties, were thus given to destruction by the sun and the hot winds. The suffering of innocent persons as a necessary result of what had been ordered was quite beyond estimate; the victims were found in every part of the country and among all classes of people.

3. But though it was meant that the strike should be peaceful, and the strikers, in emphatic terms, were admonished by their leaders

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to make it so, its leading characteristic almost immediately came to be violence. This was unavoidable. For the time being it aimed to paralyze transportation and all commerce by rail, and the greater the consequent injury and inconvenience the greater would be the probability of success. Lawless classes, who professed to be sympathizers, but cared only for disorder, saw this very plainly, and the situation soon took on some of the features of civil war. A difficulty the leaders hoped would not be encountered, it was soon discovered was likely to prove insurmountable. Laborers out of employment were now abundant; they would covet the vacant places; and unless appeals made to them to stand with their fellow-laborers in what was assumed to be their common interest should prove successful, they must by some other means be kept from the railroad service, or the strike would fail. But the needs of the unemployed and of their families were too urgent to admit of their listening to solicitation; they came forward in considerable numbers for employment, and violence, of which they were the victims, followed. The ordinary peace authorities proved unable to protect them: the worst elements of society were soon in possession of some towns, and especially of some sections of Chicago; and not only were men anxious to perform labor upon the railroads assaulted and beaten, but the torch was applied to railroad equipment and buildings, and great destruction resulted. The leaders who were directing the strike—however anxious they may have been to avoid breaches of the peace—were powerless to calm the passions that had been aroused, and the civil commotion increased daily in magnitude.

4. One question fairly arising upon the circumstances of this strike, and which, so far as I know, has hitherto received no attention, may properly be noticed here. It concerns the rights, legal and equitable, of those who were to be affected by the strike should one be declared, and raises the question whether, under principles supposed to prevail wherever free government exists, the strike, as against them, could be fully justified without careful consideration of its probable effect upon their interests being first had, and, if practicable, an opportunity given them to urge reasons, from their own standpoint, against its being entered upon. The parties who were to be injuriously affected were: first, the railroad companies, who if they were allowed to be heard through their general managers or any authorized committee on the question, whether it would be just or reasonable to declare a strike against them for what was not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their own fault, might possibly have convinced the members of the order which was then considering the question, that the objections to it from the standpoint of their employers were altogether reasonable; second, the government of the United States, whose transportation of the mails and control over interstate commerce were to be very seriously interfered with, and perhaps the service of federal process obstructed; and third, the people of the United States, whose legal right to be transported and to have their property carried by rail was to be in part, and perhaps wholly, taken away, while the strike continued, at a cost to them which must in the end be counted by millions. The public, it would seem, might have been allowed a hearing through business organizations, such as boards of trade, or through bodies like the Farmers' Alliance; and the government had even a still stronger claim to a hearing, for it was the government of the strikers themselves, and the action which was interfered with was an action of which they, in common with all the people of the United States, enjoyed the benefit. And the government might have pointed out that if the performance of its constitutional functions was hampered now in an attempt for one assigned reason to compel the railroad companies to take some particular action, it might possibly on some future occasion, for reasons still less forcible, be rendered impossible. Success in one instance would not only strengthen those who might have in view similar action in the future, but it would indirectly aid them by diminishing the courage of resistance. But the government might also have pointed out that the declaration of such a strike would be the exercise of unchecked and arbitrary power, which, where liberty prevails, is never by law provided for, since a free people would justly pronounce it unendurable tyranny, and the strikers themselves would, as citizens, never consent to be governed by a law which would admit of it. A free government is expected to submit even the most unimportant question of legal right to the adjudication of some impartial tribunal, to make provision for the hearing of interested parties, and to take precautions that the elements of passion and prejudice shall not be suffered to control the decision.

Here were three parties, all innocent as regards the grievance in question, who if the action was to be taken after the manner deemed necessary to prevent injustice in governmental proceedings, would seem to have had a strong equitable and indeed an indefeasible right to have the effect upon themselves first considered. Now I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

understand very well that the case of the ordinary strike or boycott which is entered upon for the purpose of redressing an existing wrong or to prevent one which is threatened, is to a considerable extent different. Such a case partakes of the nature of self-defence; and incidental injury to third parties, if it is unavoidable, is excused on that ground: but there was nothing in the nature of self-defence here. It was a third party who was supposed to have been wronged in this instance, and, as innocent parties were to be directly struck at and greatly injured, the very least they could justly be awarded would be a careful consideration, by those proposing the damaging action, of the question whether the necessary consequence, even if they were successful in what they hoped to accomplish, might not be that the injury to innocent parties would greatly exceed the gains, and, if so, whether the proposal could in justice be accepted. But this was a question of which no notice was taken. Innocent parties who must necessarily suffer not only had no opportunity to protest, but their losses were not taken into account as reasons against the boycott and strike. On the contrary, they were regarded as favorable features of the case, since they rendered success more probable. But a sympathetic strike is bad in morals, and must be quite as bad in policy where the probable injury to innocent parties will exceed the probable benefit to the parties it aims to assist.

The facts here stated seem to emphasize the importance of giving some thought to another feature of the case which perhaps is common when the question of a considerable body of men throwing up their employment is brought by their leaders before them, but which was particularly prominent here. It concerns the manner in which the decision of the question is arrived at.

In theory the order to throw up the service is always supposed to be authorized by the men called out, and to be based upon substantial reason. In this case the reason assigned was that the obnoxious corporation refused to submit the case made by its laborers to arbitration, which was a wrong the railroad men desired to remedy. But as their own employers could not compel the arbitration, and there were legal difficulties in the way of their taking the steps the men demanded, it would seem that the substantial reason for proceeding in a hostile way against them must in this instance have been wanting. An impression that such was the case must to some extent have existed among the men who were ordered to strike, for it seemed to be necessary to call meetings and to have them addressed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by speakers who would urge what the leaders proposed. The method whereby at these meetings an affirmative vote is secured is worthy of attention, especially by laborers themselves, who by reason of society ties are liable at any time to be drawn into similar controversies. They are most deeply concerned of all, since the vote to be taken may affect their interests for years,—perhaps for life.

The orders in which laborers unite are supposed to be self-governing, and the principles which apply to the action of municipal bodies, and which have become established because they conduce to justice, are applicable to them as well. To be wisely or even safely governed, their members must proceed deliberately, and the action taken must be the result of their best judgment coolly and dispassionately applied. In the legislative bodies of the country, from the lowest to the highest, great pains are taken by rules of order, and sometimes by statutes and constitutional restrictions, to render hasty and passionate action unlikely. The need of these precautions is so plain that no one raises any question concerning it, and it is not infrequent that action otherwise regular is annulled by the courts because cautionary formalities have been disregarded.

If we may rely upon the reports appearing in the daily papers, the proceedings taken at the meetings called to decide upon this great movement were not deliberate and dispassionate, but the speakers who were the chief actors were expected to and did appeal, not to the reason of their audiences, but to their feelings and their prejudices. Speakers who it was thought could make such appeals most successfully were brought to the meetings for the purpose. They came to excite their hearers to action, not to reason with them. The action taken was therefore had under the influence of excited feelings. Opposition to what was proposed was not expected, and was not patiently listened to. There was little in the proceedings that even resembled those of a deliberative gathering. Not only, therefore, were other interested parties not given a hearing, but even those who were deciding what should be their own action in a matter vitally affecting the interests of some, if not of all, contented themselves with listening to a passionate appeal, and responding by a hurrah. The decision thus reached was conclusive. The general fact was that a deliberative and patient hearing was had by no one. This was the case until it was deemed necessary to appeal to other orders also, and then the proceedings were quite different. But when deliberate action came to be taken, different results followed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These matters are mentioned because they bear directly upon questions of justice and right that are necessarily involved when such a movement in the industrial world is proposed. With what justice can it be entered upon when innocent parties are of necessity to be sufferers to an enormous extent therefrom, without their rights being taken into account, and their probable losses allowed due weight in reaching a decision? And how can men who live by their labor wisely or even safely throw up their employment as a means of coercion, before they have carefully considered in all its bearings what is proposed, and its effects upon their own interests, not only if it shall prove successful, but also if it fail?

5. In our notice of this great internal commotion some attention is due to a question of constitutional law which was raised by some of the governors of States. When interstate commerce was interrupted, the transmission of the mails seriously impeded, and the service of process issued by the federal courts rendered difficult or impossible, President Cleveland sent to Chicago, the point of greatest disturbance and disorder, a considerable military force to aid the civil officers and to protect the carriers of the mails and the persons and vehicles employed in interstate transportation while they continued or made efforts to continue in the performance of the customary service. This at once brought out a protest from the governor of Illinois, who insisted that the President was encroaching upon the rights of the State. The foundation for the protest is understood to have been that the duty to maintain public order and enforce the laws was a State duty which Illinois was quite able and willing to perform, and that the federal executive had no right to act in case of domestic disorder until demand was made upon him by the State legislature or executive. Governors of some other States were understood to concur in this view. When the President replied to the protest that the United States troops were sent into the States only to enforce national laws, to put an end to interruptions of the mails, to protect interstate commerce, and see that the authority of federal courts was maintained,—in other words to support the national jurisdiction and protect officers and agents in the performance of national duties,—the reply was treated as insufficient, the protest was repeated from time to time, and the consequent excitement tended to keep the disorderly elements bold and defiant, so that the demand was even made by some of them that the governor should employ the military power of the State to remove the federal forces.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The governor was original in the doctrine he presented for our admiration and acceptance in this case. We all remember that the right of a State to nullify an act of Congress was once claimed, and that the right of a State to withdraw from the Union at one time had a great many supporters. We all know that from the very first there have been political parties, led by able and patriotic statesmen, who have insisted upon a strict construction of grants of national authority and of the powers to be exercised under them. But in this case nullification was not suggested; secession was not thought of. The grant to Congress of the power to provide for the transportation of the mails and to regulate interstate commerce was not questioned in the least. Congress had exercised these powers, and it was not claimed that in doing so it had unwarrantably expanded them or encroached upon State rights. Congress had also provided for United States courts in Illinois, which courts were then in session, and it was not pretended that in issuing the customary process they could be lawfully interfered with or the process denied service. We see, then, that there were national duties to be performed in Illinois, national officers, agents, and courts to whom in part the performance was entrusted, and disorderly parties were interfering and rendering performance difficult, oftentimes impossible. But the position of the governor was that the maintenance of peace and the repression of disorder was a State duty, and the President was consequently guilty of usurpation when he thus without request moved troops into the State for the purpose.

We cannot admit that the position taken is even plausible. It has no warrant whatever in the federal constitution, which, on the contrary, is distinctly against it. The President is to take care that the federal laws be faithfully executed, and his doing so is not made to depend upon the will or consent of any one State. The duty is specially and in the plainest terms imposed upon him, and in the performance of it he is subordinate to no State authority. Yet, if the views of this governor were accepted as sound, the mails might be stopped at Chicago, interstate commerce broken up, and the process of United States courts refused service, unless the governor, when disorder was dominant, saw fit to suppress it or to call upon the President to do so. If the protest was yielded to, it was a concession that the governor, and not the President, was to take care that the laws of the United States were faithfully executed in his State, and, if he failed to do so, a mob might at pleasure defy them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It seems needless to take up time in discussing this protest: the action taken by the two houses of Congress in approving in emphatic terms the action of the President was equivalent to an expression of their opinion that the protest of the governor was not only unwarranted, but was revolutionary. The sentiment of the country as expressed in its public journals and otherwise was to the same effect, and the question of constitutional law may be considered practically settled. It is fortunate that it is so; for such a protest from the executive of a great State must necessarily tend at any time to still further excite the passions of those who in a mad way are defying the lawful authorities.

6. I have had something to say of the duties of members of the bar, and I shall now add a few words as specially applicable to crises like the one here alluded to. In doing so I may perhaps without impropriety so extend what I say that it shall be applicable to all who, in important positions, and especially as members of our national legislature, are to a considerable degree dependent, for their prominence as well as for the opportunity to be useful, upon the public favor. Very often they have to deal with difficult questions in government such as those concerning political economy and finance; and we may suppose they have been selected for their positions because of their peculiar ability and fitness to do so wisely. But not infrequently we feel compelled to question, as in the daily journals we follow their public life, whether a legislator, thus presumably chosen to act independently and fearlessly upon his own mature and enlightened judgment, does not sometimes, instead of considering with deliberation the questions upon which he must act, content himself with gathering as best he may the sentiment of his constituents, and with expressing it in his public action, even when he believes it to be erroneous and possibly dangerous, and when he cannot fail to perceive that the local sentiment is the result of artful teaching, or mischievous appeals to prejudice by interested parties or by demagogues. It is easy in that way to float with a popular current, and perhaps to make sure of continued popular support. But the question must often be presented to his mind whether the current might not be altogether otherwise if in an honorable and fearless way he took steps to correct the erroneous views which, while he remains silent, are certain to control, and whether his constituents have not a right to expect of him that, instead of submitting to follow when he knows they blindly lead, he will give

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his best ability to making his service as useful as possible to them and to the country, and to that end will endeavor to instruct his people when they need instruction, and so, by force of character and force of reason, to lead them.

When the man who is both a statesman and a leader shall bring the results of observation and experience to a consideration of the difficulties which beset the relation of employer and employee, and which year by year seem to grow more troublesome, he may perhaps be expected to give anxious attention to the question whether the benefits of arbitration in that class of difficulties cannot be greatly extended. There is an impression that this is possible, and he will find laws on the statute-books of the nation and of some States having for their object to aid in the removal, by means of a tribunal of peace, of the causes of contention which now in so many cases result in disorder, and in great pecuniary loss to one party or the other, commonly to both. He will inquire whether the benefits of such tribunals cannot by legislation be made to embrace all of what are known as labor controversies, and he will find many to urge upon him the view they hold that compulsory arbitration may be made a complete and adequate remedy when disorders prevail in the industrial world. Some attention to this view seems not unimportant.

"Arbitration," as the word has come to us, is understood to mean the voluntary submission, by the parties to a controversy, of the matters on which they differ, to the decision of one or more impartial persons, whose award thereon shall be final. The most notable characteristic is that the initiation of the proceeding is voluntary; such, at least, has been the understanding hitherto. The tribunals to which the law gives compulsory power over the controversies of individuals are the courts, and even these are to deal only with questions of legal right and legal obligation; they cannot enforce mere moral duties unless the law has made such duties legal also. But the vast majority of labor controversies involve, as between the parties to them, no question whatever of legal right. They involve disputes over wages or hours of labor where no binding contract exists that fixes them; disputes as to continuance of the relation when one party or the other desires to terminate it, and his moral right to do so is disputed, but not his legal right; disputes as to the employment of non-union men, and the like. If arbitration could embrace only the labor controversies in respect to legal rights, it would be of very slight value. The award on a voluntary submission may in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other cases establish a legal right which the courts can enforce, but the limits to compulsory power in this respect must be very narrow. No employer can be compelled to continue his business when, for alleged want of capital or of profits, or for any other reason, he refuses to do so; and laborers cannot be led by the sheriff to their daily task when they refuse to obey the arbitrators' award that it is their duty to continue at their work. The award may, in a sense, be binding on the one or the other; but the party obtaining it must in such case content himself with an action for damages.

If one shall say to us that it is as competent to provide laws for bringing parties unwillingly before a board of arbitrators as before a court, and to make the action of the one tribunal as much as that of the other compulsory, the answer must be that neither to the one nor to the other can powers be given to enforce against the citizen that which the law does not require him to perform. The name of a tribunal does not determine what powers may be given it; but when it is sought to obtain relief which the party summoned before the tribunal has a legal right to refuse, his consent to submit to the jurisdiction of the tribunal is indispensable. The State may even in such cases provide for investigation of the controversy by a tribunal established for the purpose, as Congress has already done, but not for a trial against the consent of the parties, and compulsory submission to the decision. This seems unquestionable.

But, passing this question, let us see what would have been the position of the late controversy if, at the time it arose, there had been a national board of arbitration and a law of Congress to compel laborers and their employers to submit their disputes to arbitration.

First, we are to bear in mind that the original controversy was between an Illinois manufacturing corporation and its laborers. The corporation gave notice that the laborers must accept lower wages than were being paid, or the losses on the business would be such that the works must be closed. The laborers called for arbitration, and the corporation replied that there was nothing to arbitrate. A strike followed. We shall dismiss this now with the single remark that, as the contract which had existed in this case was for service to be performed locally, the controversy could not come under any national law of arbitration, and the laborers, if wronged, must look to the State of Illinois for a remedy.

When the manufacturing corporation refused arbitration, a strong union composed of railway employees in various branches of service

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

declared a boycott and went out on a sympathetic strike. It is this strike that has been so damaging to themselves and especially to the country. The immediate settlement of this, by any legitimate arbitration or by any other just means, would have been a great boon to the country and to the industrial interests involved.

But suppose a national law providing for compulsory arbitration had then existed, and the strikers had demanded the intervention of the arbitration board, what must have been the result? Obviously, after the board had looked into the case, it would have been compelled to say that under the law they could give no remedy, for it had no application whatever to the case. The strike was by railroad employees, and they and their employers were the only parties to it. But the cause of complaint which led to the strike was a controversy between other parties altogether: parties who stood indeed in hostile attitude to each other, but were not parties to this strike, and could not be brought in to take part in the arbitration demanded. The board summoned to consider this would be wholly without jurisdiction to determine or even to look into the merits of the controversy which was the excuse for the one now brought to its attention. If, therefore, the board could take any action whatever, it would be merely to report that the present strike was not based upon any complaint made against the railroad companies, that there was no controversy between the parties to it to be investigated and passed upon, and consequently the board had no jurisdiction and must dismiss the case. This would seem unavoidable.

In what is said here it must be understood that no allusion is made to the probable action of a commission such as has recently been appointed by President Cleveland to investigate and report upon the late troubles. The President has made most admirable selections for the purpose, and the country has confidence in the wisdom, the prudence, and the integrity of the men chosen; and whether their report shall or shall not fully enlighten us as to the wrongs and rights of what has already taken place, it can scarcely fail to do something toward indicating for the future more satisfactory ways of dealing with labor controversies than by instituting industrial wars. The best wishes of the country will attend the efforts they may make in that direction, and we may be certain that remedies having their approval will be truly peaceful, which a strike on a large scale very seldom is.

But if it were possible to establish compulsory arbitration in a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

case where the controversy was not between the parties to the strike, I should venture to ask whether parties injured by the strike, rather than those whose interests were sympathetic merely, ought not to be at liberty to appeal to the law. Consider, for a moment, what actually occurred here. A great many thousand persons were by the strike absolutely deprived of legal rights, and injured in the aggregate to an enormous amount thereby. A great many passengers who had paid for being transported across the country, and who had a legal right to proceed without detention, were side-tracked without their consent, and were put to great inconvenience and pecuniary loss. A great many shippers of goods suffered loss by detention, and whole train-loads of perishable goods were in some cases ruined by delays which the strike had caused. In every one of these and the like cases, the injury was a direct result of the strike, and in many cases the circumstances were such that there would probably be no legal remedy against the carriers. The strike, therefore, resulted in the destruction of rights of unoffending parties who were powerless to protect their own interests or to do anything by way of restoring the normal condition of things. Why should not the parties upon whom losses were visited under such circumstances be at liberty, under a law for compulsory arbitration, to appeal immediately to the board for an investigation of the complaints, if any, made by the strikers against the railroad companies, and to insist that the board should demand that the strike be declared off when it was found that between the parties to the strike there was no existing controversy, or none over which the board could have jurisdiction? Why, for example, should not one of the great packers of Chicago, whose property in enormous quantities was to be ruined without his fault, and whose legal right to deliver it by rail to his customers was to be taken away, have been at liberty to demand the immediate intervention of the arbitration board, and its prompt determination that his legal rights must be respected? Parties whose interests were put in peril might, perhaps, under such a law, with entire justice have protection given them even when the parties to the quarrel, who had struck on sentimental reasons only, did not see fit to invoke its assistance. No class of persons—not even the laborers at Pullman—had a stronger claim to the immediate intervention of a tribunal with peacemaking powers than those who were being deprived of their rights in transportation. A woman, for example, travelling from New York to California, with ailing children and barely means

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough for her journey, side-tracked and suffering for days at Battle Creek!—whose claim to the immediate intervention of a compulsory board of arbitration could be greater than hers? And she was no outside party, as the laborers at Pullman were, but was directly and immediately concerned.

In what I have here said I have endeavored to point out in few words some of the obstacles in the way of making compulsory arbitration the effectual remedy in labor controversies, which many seem to think it is in time to become. The personal liberty of both the employer and the laborer is necessarily to be respected, and every man must be left to determine for himself whether he will observe and perform such moral or sentimental obligations, or recognize such claims, as the State has never deemed it wise to convert into legal duties or legal rights. Upon these and kindred subjects a true leader may make the inherent difficulties so plain that destructive conflicts will become inexcusable and also uncommon. He can clearly show that boards of arbitration with their orders—and I may add, also, courts with their injunctions—if they heed the fundamental law of the land, can no more hold men to involuntary servitude, for even a single hour, than can overseers with the whip. But he can also point out that, by contract when the service begins, the peaceful remedies provided by law can be greatly extended; that the sudden termination or damaging change of the relation by either party can be provided against; and that any other stipulation, important for the security of rights or to guard against the consequences of misfortune, may be made part of the terms of employment. The usefulness of such contracts may be made so plain that they will from year to year become more common; and the legislation in furtherance of peaceable settlements, though it must fall far short of adequately providing for all disputes likely to arise between employers and their men, will nevertheless so forcibly express the public sentiment against existing methods that we may reasonably expect that such methods will in a little time become far less common than now, if they do not altogether cease to be resorted to. The legal difficulties in the way of a complete remedy will remain, and will be serious at almost every point; but the very knowledge of their existence will emphasize the need of precautions to prevent a resort to violent measures when arbitration is inadequate, and to give additional force to the public opinion which will look with emphatic disfavor upon any refusal of arbitration when that seems a suitable and sufficient

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remedy for alleged wrongs. The employer cannot be compelled to continue his business when it has become unprofitable; that is plain; but if the contract of service is for a definite time, he must expect to respond in damages if he terminates it before the time has expired, whatever may be his excuse. If the laborer leaves the service before the time of hiring is completed, he, too, may be liable in damages, and the employer must rely upon this for redress, and will be supposed to take into account the possibility that the laborer may prove irresponsible as one of the incidents necessarily affecting the pecuniary results of his business.

But perhaps the legislator or the commission who will lead us in this important work may look for the most useful results to flow from his efforts in familiarizing the classes to be affected with the thought that, if disagreements arise, peaceable measures, founded on a review of all the facts, are to settle them. The looking forward to such a settlement will of itself have a powerful influence in bringing it about; and when it comes to be fully understood that the States and the nation alike are wanting in power to force upon unwilling parties such arbitration as shall be effectual in all cases, we shall perhaps be spared the sorrowful spectacle of wholesale destruction of the rights and property of innocent third persons, which must almost of necessity result from a strike or boycott so extensive, indiscriminating, and persistent as was the case with the one above brought under consideration. Strikes are very often peaceful and harmless except to the parties immediately concerned, but peace was impossible here. And our statesman-leader, we may be sure, will never overlook the fact, or fail to give it due prominence, that there is one class of strikes that can never be settled by arbitration. That is the sympathetic strike; and the reason is obvious: the parties to the strike are not the parties to the controversy that needs to be settled; and if the sympathizers are held justified, the original quarrel still remains undetermined. A finding made by a given number of arbitrators as to the merits of the original controversy in such a case would be an idle fulmination of opinion, having behind it no force of law, and going no farther to fix a moral obligation upon any party concerned than would a like expression by any other equal number of equally intelligent members of the community.

T. M. Cooley.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TEACHING BY TRAVEL: A SCHOOL EXCURSION FROM INDIANA TO VIRGINIA.

THE general tendency on the part of our people to oppose the introduction of all methods of instruction that do not savor of the old-fashioned mechanical routine, is, in my opinion, one of the greatest barriers to educational progress in our country to-day. This opposition is based, as a rule, upon the erroneous notion that natural methods of instruction are new and untried, and consequently experimental, and that we are not justified in converting our schools into experimental institutions. If those who are of this opinion would obtain a knowledge of the history of education, however superficial, they would soon become convinced that the "new education," so called, is by no means new; that scarcely a method can be mentioned which has not been in vogue in one or another of the European countries for half a century or more; and that many methods still denounced in America as innovations have long been classed among the essentials by the most conservative educators of Germany.

Among these is the school excursion—the method to be discussed in the present article. Indeed, while to the uninitiated this measure may be regarded as no less than revolutionary, it is nevertheless true that excursions from two to three weeks in duration were undertaken by Salzmann with the pupils of his school at Schnepfenthal in Thuringia, when Washington was President of the United States. Since the close of the last century, the school excursion, in one form or another, has been growing in popularity in Germany, and to-day it forms a regular feature of perhaps the majority of the elementary schools of that country.

The school excursion offers the most favorable opportunity for introducing children into many branches of knowledge, as they may thereby be brought into direct contact with nature and the works of man. Indeed, the locality is exceptionally unfavorable where an abundance of material may not be found for instructing the child in geography, history, and the natural sciences. In Germany, this broad study of the environment is recognized as a distinct branch of knowledge,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

known as *die Heimathskunde* (home-ology), and as such is included in the curriculum of the first three years of the elementary schools.

During these years the excursions are usually of a nature calculated to familiarize the child with his home-surroundings in general. When this period is over, they become specialized into botanical, geological, geographical, historical, industrial expeditions, and so on. The ideas acquired during the general excursions of the earlier years are, in the higher grades, made to serve as a basis of comparison, and thus form material for the exercise of the imagination, while the pupil is engaged in acquiring ideas concerning things beyond his immediate reach. In some instances, however, when the study of the immediate home-surroundings has been completed, the general excursions do not cease, but are continued throughout the entire school course, becoming ever wider in their scope. Under such circumstances, beginning with the fourth school year, a study of the home, in a broader sense, is undertaken on annual outings from one to two weeks in duration.

While, in our own country, the instructive excursion is not entirely unknown, it has nevertheless as yet played only an insignificant part in American school life. In some localities a few teachers are in the habit of taking their pupils on short excursions from time to time; but thus far, I believe, nothing systematic in this direction has been attempted. In regard to the extended excursion, undertaken by *public-school* teachers with their pupils, the one here described is, as far as I can learn, the first made in the United States.

The idea of the excursion from Anderson (Indiana) was conceived last March, when, during a visit to that city, I called the attention of Superintendent Carr to the details of a seven-days excursion through the Thuringian Forest, undertaken in August, 1893, by the School of Practice connected with the University of Jena, in Saxony. This expedition impressed Mr. Carr so favorably, that he became imbued with the desire to arrange such a trip for the pupils of the Anderson schools, to be undertaken at the close of the school year. The superintendent's plans were heartily approved by the members of the Anderson board of education. By the teachers and pupils the project was received with enthusiasm; and many of the parents expressed their willingness to provide their children with the necessary funds.

As the tour was to be a pioneer attempt in our country, it was thought advisable to extend its privileges only to the pupils of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

highest grammar-grade and of the high-school. Nevertheless, the number attending the outing was seventy-eight, as follows: The superintendent, the principal of the high-school, the president and the treasurer of the board of education, fourteen teachers, nineteen grammar-school pupils, thirty-six high-school pupils, and the county superintendent. In addition to these, there were a physician to care for the party, a stenographer to aid in keeping a record, and a few guests, including myself. Males and females were about equal in number.

It was the principal aim of the Anderson excursion to undertake a pilgrimage to important points of historical interest, and to give to the pupils an object-lesson on as many geographical elements as possible. With these purposes in view, no route more favorable than the one finally selected could have been found, including as it did one of the most interesting districts of our country, historically, as well as by reason of almost every imaginable geographical element. Not one of the pupils, and only one or two of the teachers, had seen the ocean or a mountain, and but few of them had ever experienced the sensation of riding on a steamboat. One of the pupils had never been on a train. Consequently to the teachers as well as the pupils the entire ground covered was new. The route was as follows: from Anderson, via Indianapolis, to Cincinnati; across the Ohio to Kentucky; through Kentucky and the mountains of West Virginia to Clifton Forge, Virginia; across the Shenandoah and Piedmont valleys, via Richmond, to Old Point Comfort; thence to Newport News; across Hampton Roads to Norfolk; by train from Norfolk to Virginia Beach, returning to Norfolk by train; by boat up Chesapeake Bay and the Potomac to Washington; returning to Anderson via Cincinnati. The distance was about 1,800 miles, the journey's duration seven days. The cost per capita, under the special arrangement made, including fares and all expenses in hotels, boats, and trains, was only thirty dollars. The party started from Anderson on Monday morning, June 4, at six o'clock. A special train was furnished, connecting with the early train from Indianapolis to Cincinnati.

The country between Anderson and Indianapolis is flat, and contains no special points of interest. Between Indianapolis and Cincinnati, however, the attention of the pupils was called to many places particularly interesting to the people of Indiana. At North Bend the Ohio River came into view, and the hills of Kentucky—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practically the first elevations of land that the majority of the pupils had ever seen—became visible. The train skirted the river for thirty miles, and the river shanties and steamboats proved of much interest.

The first thing of importance after leaving Cincinnati was the magnificent iron bridge which spans the Ohio between Cincinnati and Covington. After reaching the Kentucky side, Point Pleasant, the birthplace of General Grant, came in sight. By means of talks from time to time, the pupils received much information concerning the industries of the various localities through which we passed. While passing through the coal regions of West Virginia, the manner in which the mines were operated was explained. The scenery all along the line was charming. After crossing the Big Sandy and the Guyandotte rivers, the train entered the valley of the Kanawha, where the high hills began to appear. We followed this valley to Kanawha Falls. Here the hills became higher and higher, until we had before us a characteristic picture of mountain scenery, which naturally made a deep impression on the pupils, who before that day had seen only flat country. Thence we passed into the New River cañon, the most picturesque part of the road. The scenery here is very rugged. The famous Hawk's Nest, which rises to a height of twelve hundred feet above the river, is situated near the entrance. We reached Clifton Forge shortly before midnight, and spent the night there.

On the following morning the pupils were up bright and early, anxious for their first mountain walk. At eight o'clock, Major Jedd Hotchkiss, a well-known geologist, joined the party at the hotel. He first delivered a short address on the geological conditions of Clifton Forge and the vicinity, which was illustrated by photographs and maps. We returned to the hotel shortly before noon, and after dinner departed for Richmond, where we had arranged to pass the second night. The stretch of country between Clifton Forge and Richmond, a distance of one hundred and ninety-three miles, is interesting at every point. Not only is the scenery very picturesque, but the region is one that has played a very important part in American history.

Soon after leaving Clifton Forge, we caught a view of Elliott's Knob, the highest mountain in Virginia. A little later the train passed through Buffalo Gap, a natural opening in the North Mountain, in the Alleghanies. A ride across the Shenandoah Valley followed; and soon we entered the Piedmont Valley, which is noted for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its garden-like scenery. Major Hotchkiss, who had taken an active part in the Civil War, accompanied our party for a considerable distance, pointing out various points of interest. He gave many vivid accounts of acts that took place in the Shenandoah Valley during the war, and he explained to the pupils why the valley figured so prominently in the contest. When he had left, Mr. Truitt, our regular guide, gave us much information concerning that section of the country.

In various places earthworks may still be seen. At Charlottesville we caught a glimpse of the University of Virginia, as well as of Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson. The train passed through Shadwell, the birthplace of Jefferson. At Afton we saw the inn where Presidents Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, with other commissioners, met to select a site for the University of Virginia.

On our arrival at the hotel in Richmond, we found a number of citizens waiting to receive us. They kindly offered to do all they could to render our visit instructive. When our visitors had departed, a meeting was held by the teachers. During the discussion, the fact was brought out that thus far nothing had been done toward orderly arranging in the minds of the pupils the facts thus far acquired by them. It was consequently decided that before leaving the hotel in the morning, a general class-meeting should be held. Next, the programme for the following day was arranged. In order that as much as possible might be accomplished during our short stay at Richmond, it was decided that the tour of the city be made in carriages. In the morning we were driven through a number of business and residence streets, so that we might receive a general impression of the city. During this ride, a number of places of historical interest were pointed out. After this tour we drove through the park to the cemetery, where we visited the graves of many of our heroes. Among the numerous places of interest pointed out to us during the drive were St. John's Church, where Patrick Henry made his famous speech; Washington's old headquarters; the residences of Jefferson Davis, General Lee, and Chief Justice Marshall; the site of Libby Prison; statues of Washington, Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and others. As the mayor had expressed a desire to give us a reception, we called at his office after our drive. Following this, the Governor of Virginia received us in his rooms at the Capitol. The sight-seeing at Richmond was closed with an examination of many interesting historical relics. At three o'clock we boarded the train for Old Point Comfort. The ride was again an interesting one.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soon after passing through the earthworks surrounding the city of Richmond we ran by the battlefield of Seven Pines. Next we crossed the Chickahominy River, where we obtained a glimpse of the island where Captain John Smith is supposed to have been captured. Another point of historical interest was Williamsburg, the second capital of the State. William and Mary College, the second university founded in America, is here situated. Old Point Comfort was reached at six o'clock.

In the evening a prolonged session was held by the entire party in one of the parlors of the hotel. During this session, which was devoted exclusively to recitations in geography and history, an effort was made to clinch the points thus far acquired by the pupils. The recitation in history assumed the form of a general review of the Civil War, with particular reference to the Shenandoah Valley. During the recitation in geography, the teacher endeavored to get from the pupils a connected story relating to the districts through which we had thus far travelled.

On the following morning a profitable hour was spent at Fortress Monroe. A soldier guided us around and gave us lucid explanations concerning the various points. In this instance the sight-seeing was particularly profitable, because it was accompanied by a recitation. Whenever a few points had been explained to the pupils, Superintendent Carr took charge of the classes and questioned the scholars on what they had heard. It is indeed only under such circumstances that the proper form of mental activity on the part of the pupils may be expected. When we take for granted that pupils actually observe and comprehend whatever they ought to see and understand, a grievous error is committed. The visit to the fortress was instructive geographically as well as historically. The view of Chesapeake Bay at this point, with Cape Charles and Cape Henry in the distance, is charming.

Our visit to the fortress over, we departed for Newport News. There we paid a visit to the ship-yards. The guide who conducted us through the yards explained in detail the operations and the apparatus of the dry docks. By means of the powerful pump shown to us, 150,000 gallons of water can be displaced in a minute, and the large dock pumped dry in from one to two hours. Our visit to the ship-yards was again accompanied by a recitation conducted by the superintendent.

At Newport News we boarded the boat for a twelve-mile ride

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

across Hampton Roads to Norfolk. This was the first boat-ride ever taken by some of the members of the party. It proved a very pleasant hour to them. Time did not permit us to stop at Norfolk. We simply walked through the city to the railway station, where we entered the train for Virginia Beach. It was at the latter place that the pupils received their first view of the ocean. The four hours at this resort allowed us ample time to bathe in the sea, and to stroll on the beautiful beach after dinner. The visit to the beach was one of the brightest spots of the tour. We returned to Norfolk in time to take the boat for Washington at six in the evening. As the night was fine, we were able to stay on deck for a number of hours, and thus enjoy a considerable part of the sail on Chesapeake Bay; and as we did not arrive at the capital until seven o'clock, the pupils were able, during the early hours of the morning, to appreciate a good part of the sail up the Potomac River.

While in Washington the pupils were full of enthusiasm. They were charmed with everything they saw. Nearly all Friday morning was consumed by a visit to the Capitol. The party being so large, the tour of the building was made in two divisions, each in charge of a guide. While on our rounds, we were fortunate enough to find the Senate in session. Our morning's work was concluded by a visit to the Navy Yard, where we followed the various processes involved in the manufacture of firearms, and inspected a small man-of-war. The afternoon was devoted to a visit to Mount Vernon. The tour of the grounds and the house at Mount Vernon was followed by a recitation, held on one of the lawns. During this recitation the history of the Mount Vernon estate, as well as important events of the time of General Washington, were reviewed. We returned to the city late in the afternoon. After supper, half an hour was devoted to instruction in the hotel parlor. The party then divided into several sections. Some of the pupils, accompanied by a few teachers, visited the theatre; others attended a night session of the House of Representatives; while still others spent the evening quietly at the hotel.

On Saturday morning, before leaving the hotel, an hour was spent in a general review. At ten o'clock we started on our tour through the city. The places visited during the morning were the Pension Office, the Dead-Letter Office, the Patent Museum in the Department of the Interior, the Treasury Building, and the Corcoran Art Gallery. At one o'clock the White House was reached. As a public reception was held at the time, the tourists were afforded an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opportunity to shake hands with the President. In the afternoon, they were left free to do as they desired. Some visited the National Museum and the Smithsonian Institution, and a large number ascended the Washington Monument. Late in the afternoon a drive was taken through the residence portion of the city to the Zoological Gardens. On Sunday morning all were tired; nevertheless some twenty of the tourists paid a visit to Arlington.

At two o'clock in the afternoon the party boarded the Chesapeake and Ohio train for Cincinnati, on their homeward journey. The road from Gordonsville to Cincinnati had been traversed on the outward journey; but the country between Washington and Gordonsville, a distance of ninety-four miles, was new. This part of the country was rich in points made famous by the Civil War. The night was passed on the train. All reached Anderson in the afternoon of Monday, June 11, just one week after starting.

Generally speaking, then, as a pioneer attempt, the Anderson excursion was a marked success. It was, indeed, an enjoyable, interesting, suggestive, and profitable affair. And, above all, it served to prove beyond a doubt that the school excursion is feasible in our country. The opinion has been frequently expressed that journeys of this nature could not be successfully carried out in America, because our children, when out of the school-room, would not, like the Germans, submit to the authority of their teachers. In regard to the pupils of the Anderson schools, this theory proved entirely unfounded; their obedience was perfect. Indeed, too much praise cannot be bestowed upon them for their manly and womanly behavior. It was seldom found necessary to exercise any control over the young people, simply because they had learned to control themselves. Indeed, self-control on the part of the pupils is a characteristic feature of the schools of our country. It was the unanimous verdict of the railway employees and the hotel proprietors and clerks, that our party, in spite of its size, was one of the most orderly they had ever encountered. During the entire excursion, the spirit manifested on all sides was excellent; every one was delighted and happy, and all looked forward with anticipation to a future trip of a similar nature.

And yet the affair was not without flaws. While, in regard to the spirit, little was left to be desired, the same is not true of the pedagogical features. The lack of strength on the pedagogical side,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

due largely to want of experience, was owing to the fact that, beyond the selection of the route, the plans were indefinite; besides, the special preparation on the part of both teachers and pupils was inadequate. In consequence of these omissions the affair was characterized by aimless sight-seeing rather than by definiteness of purpose. That travel in itself is a powerful educator, cannot be denied; yet the educational value of any given tour will depend largely upon the manner in which it is conducted. A six-months tour through the museums and art-galleries of Europe, under judicious guidance, may result in an education in history and art; while a similar tour without such guidance may lead to nothing beyond a jumble of ideas. On our excursion, lack of definiteness led to delays, and consequently to loss of time; while lack of preparation on the part of the teachers and pupils resulted in indefinite work.

In regard to the details concerning the preparation for an excursion, much can be learned from Germany, with its experience of a century in this line of work. I shall therefore add here, by way of suggestion, an outline of the method followed by the School of Practice connected with the University of Jena, whose journeys are conducted on strictly scientific principles.

At Jena we find that each expedition is preceded by a thorough preparation on the part of both teachers and pupils. In regard to the pupil, the preparation takes place by means of a series of special recitations, during which the route is carefully studied, maps are drawn, and the points to be observed are discussed in outline. Thus their minds are placed in an attitude of expectancy, and consequently in the condition most favorable to the acquisition of new ideas.

As to the teachers, the work of the journey is usually so divided that those who take an active part shall teach only during a single day. On that day, however, the one who teaches takes complete charge of all the proceedings. At a special teachers' meeting, held several weeks in advance, the particular days are selected by mutual agreement. The work of preparation on the part of the teacher now begins, and it consists in studying from maps, railway guides, books of travel, and so on, the details concerning the points of interest—historical, industrial, geographical, geological, botanical—lying within the district assigned to him. In arranging the programme for the day on which he has charge, he accounts for every hour. The programme, once made, is carried out to the letter. The sight-seeing is invariably undertaken in the form of a recitation. Lessons given

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the road are particularly valuable, because they have been thoroughly prepared in advance.

It affords me much pleasure, in this connection, to be able to state that the privilege of studying pedagogy and allied subjects at Jena—the world's centre for the study of the Herbartian system—is destined soon to be extended to women. While abroad this past summer I called the attention of Professor Rein—the professor of pedagogy—to the fact that to grant permission to American women to attend his lectures and to instruct in the University School of Practice would be doing an excellent service to our schools. After a few consultations and before my departure from Jena he promised me, first, that without further consideration he would permit our women to instruct in the School of Practice, and, second, that as soon as the number of applicants should reach, say, ten, he would undertake to deliver privately to women lectures similar to those given before the students in the University. Professor Eucken, of the Department of Philosophy, gave me a similar promise in regard to his lectures on philosophy and logic, and I received the further assurance that the heads of other departments would follow in the footsteps of these professors. The admission of women to the University itself does not lie within their control.[1]

Finally, experience acquired during the Anderson excursion leads me to offer the following additional suggestions:

First, I should recommend that the classes be divided into sections, and that each section be placed in charge of a teacher taking an active part in the work. Indeed, the teacher in charge should at all times have an eye on his pupils.

Second, I would suggest that, on a journey a week in duration, some of the time be devoted to rusticating. A day or two spent in the woods, travelling on foot or in wagons to selected points of interest, would not only add to the enjoyment of the tour, but give an opportunity for nature studies. By this means, also, the fatigue of a continued series of extended railway journeys would be avoided.

Now that Anderson has made the beginning, it is to be hoped that excursions from other localities will follow. And if the preparation on the part of both teachers and pupils be thorough, there is no reason why excursions undertaken in our country should not be fully as profitable as those in Germany. J. M. RICE.

[1] If those interested in this matter will communicate with me, in care of THE FORUM, I shall be pleased to send them further particulars.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PROPORTION OF COLLEGE-TRAINED PREACHERS.[1]

On the gateway of Harvard University are inscribed the first words of the first notice of college education in British America:

> "After God had carried us safe to New-England, and wee had builded our houses, provided necessaries for our liveli-hood, rear'd convenient places for God's worship, and setled the Civill Government: One of the next things we longed for, and looked after was to advance Learning and perpetuate it to Posterity; dreading to leave an illiterate Ministery to the Churches, when our present Ministers shall lie in the Dust."

Many a tourist smiles as he reads this inscription, partly, no doubt, because of its antique form, but partly because it tells of an ideal of education which is of an antique world. What a transformation has come over that little academy, founded for the training of Puritan ministers! What an unrecognizable thing would modern education appear to the author of "New England's First Fruits"! Most of our earlier colleges, and many of our later ones, were endowed for the support of a sect and for the training of its ministers; and most of them have been led into a liberty of choice and an expansion of instruction which quite obscure the original object of the founders. What effect, one asks himself, is this new conception of education having on the profession of the ministry? Are the colleges abandoning their original function? Have we again reason to dread "an illiterate ministry when our present ministers shall lie in the dust"? What is the present relation of the colleges to the ministry? Is the talk of the time justified which assumes that the ministry has forfeited the interest of scholars, and that the colleges, in their devotion to other ends, have turned from that purpose with which they began? Those who care for organized religion may perhaps be interested in even a partial inquiry into these questions.

[1] Contributed by The Sociological Group, composed of the members whose names are given below. It is understood that each writer has had the benefit of suggestions from the Group, but is himself alone responsible for opinions expressed in a paper to which his name is subscribed.

Charles W. Shields. Seth Low. Francis G. Peabody. Henry C. Potter.
Charles A. Briggs. William F. Slocum, Jr. Theodore T Munger. Washington Gladden.
Edward J. Phelps. Wm. Chauncy Langdon. William M. Sloane. Samuel W. Dike.
Charles Dudley Warner.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Such an inquiry does not, of course, pretend to go to the root of religious influence. It does not assume that the only useful minister is a college graduate, or that every college graduate is fit to be a minister. And yet it must be confessed that many of the religious problems of the present age call, first of all, for scholarly methods and discipline, and can be effectively dealt with only by liberally educated men. Here is the cause of much of the reaction among the educated from religion. It is not uncommonly believed that the teachers of religion are not up to their present task; that the modern minister is not, in the same sense as other professional men are, a trained and competent expert; and so the churches are abandoned by many educated men as resorts of half-educated sentimentalism and sociability. But what are the facts as to this training for the ministry? Is the popular notion of a decline of intellectual standard in the profession justified? How many Bachelors of Arts of our colleges—as a matter of fact—used to enter the profession, and how many enter it now? Where among the colleges does the source of supply seem to fail, and under what influences does its stream run full? These are the questions which have led to the collection of a few statistics which seem to indicate a reply. An adequate statistical inquiry, dealing with the whole, or even with a large part, of the American colleges, would be a very serious task, which some more competent student should soon undertake. There are simply set together here the facts of a few colleges, selected, not on any fixed principle of importance, but as being, on the whole, either best known or most accessible to inquiry. There are probably other colleges which could show equally striking figures, and which would reward a larger investigation; but to go farther would be to trespass excessively on the kindness of college officials. The following tables present the facts of twenty-eight colleges which illustrate their relation to the ministry during the last twenty-five years. No figure is given without an official guarantee behind it, so that the statement, though very incomplete, should be accurate as far as it goes.

The question presents itself in two forms, which it is convenient to keep distinct. There is, first, the question of the actual number of college graduates entering the ministry, and then the question of the proportion of these graduates to the total number of Bachelors of Arts. Are the colleges actually sending more men or fewer into the ministry as the years go by?—that is the more interesting point of view for the churches to consider. Is, on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other hand, the percentage of ministers maintained as the college classes increase in number?—that is the more interesting question from the point of view of the colleges themselves. Two sets of tables (see pp. 34,35) have therefore been compiled,—one of the actual number of Bachelors of Arts entering the ministry from each of twenty-eight colleges from 1869 to 1893; and the other of the proportion of these graduates to the whole number of Bachelors in these twenty-five years. In the case of Michigan University the facts for the last three years have not been reported; and therefore, while the statement in this case is presented as it has been kindly furnished, the results are not included in the totals, and these deal, not with twenty-eight but with twenty-seven institutions. In summing up the result of these tables of absolute and relative numbers it has seemed important to distinguish the earlier and the later movement toward the profession, so as to determine as far as possible what each college is contributing to the ministry under the most immediate influences. The tables therefore state, first, the total results for the whole period of twenty-five years, then the situation as it presents itself up to 1889, and lastly the evidence of the last five years.

Looking, in the first place, at these figures as a whole, we notice that the total result of the first table—of absolute numbers—remains practically the same throughout these years. Taking the twenty-seven colleges together, they send just about as many graduates into the university now as they have for each year during the last quarter of a century. In 1869, 123 Bachelors of Arts entered the profession, and in 1893 the number was 124. Indeed, a slight gain is indicated. During the twenty years up to 1889 the total average number was 130, and in the last five years it was 134. Taking, on the other hand, the total evidence of the second table, we have a different result. Some of the colleges considered are very large, and some very small. It is therefore not just to average their percentage. I have regarded, therefore, the whole mass of graduates of the twenty-seven colleges as one body, and have considered what proportion of that entire body has entered the ministry. Thus calculated, the percentage of the whole, as might be expected, declines, in a marked degree, from 19 per cent in 1869 to 9 per cent in 1893. It may be doubted whether this decline is peculiar to the ministry. The last twenty-five years have opened to college graduates an extraordinary number of new careers, and it is not unlikely that all the established professions would show a decline. It is to be noticed,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moreover, that the decline is not peculiarly marked during the last few years. Up to 1889 the average proportion of the entire body of graduates entering the ministry was 14 per cent, and during the last five years it has been 11 per cent. This last number, therefore, represents our present general average, by which the contribution of each college may be fairly tested. Is a college sending into the ministry more than 11 per cent of its graduates? Then it is contributing to the profession more than the average of my twenty-seven colleges. Is it, on the other hand, contributing less than 11 per cent? Then it is doing less than its average part in this service. Judged by this test, the following colleges must be regarded as in this respect successful: Boston, Brown, De Pauw, Lake Forest, Oberlin, Princeton, Trinity, Tufts, Iowa, Pennsylvania, University of the South, and Wesleyan; and the following are deficient in their contributions: Amherst, Bowdoin, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, California, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, and Yale. Colby, Tulane, and Williams are fairly on the average line.

When we turn from this total result to the separate colleges, they seem to fall into five general groups. First, there are the two Southern colleges,—Tulane, and the University of the South. Unfortunately, however, neither of these contributes anything of importance to our inquiry. Tulane has a history of but ten years, and a total of but five Bachelors of Arts entering the ministry; and the University of the South in twenty-one years has sent but 19 men into the profession. This Southern group should have been much enlarged. A second group may be made of the State universities, whose charters often prohibit official relation with religion, and whose most popular courses of study are for the most part directed to what are called "practical affairs." Reports are presented from seven of these,—California, Cornell, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, and Missouri; and all seven appear to be practically non-contributors to the ministry. Taken all together, they yield but 171 ministers in twenty-five years, or about one man apiece per annum; and even this contribution has declined proportionally from 6 per cent apiece for twenty-five years to 3 per cent during the last five years. A third group is made by the definitely denominational colleges, in which denominational influence is maintained as a conspicuous element of college life, and the ministry of a special communion is a special end of education. In this group may be placed Boston University

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TABLE I.

NUMBER OF A.B.'S ENTERING THE MINISTRY, 1869 TO 1893.

COLLEGES.	Total number of A.B.'s entering the ministry.	Average per year for 25 years.	Average until 1889.	Average for last 5 years.
Amherst College	348	13.92	16.10	5.2
Boston University	64	3.76 [17 yrs.]	3.50 [12 yrs.]	4.4
Bowdoin College	58	2.32	2.10	3.2
Brown University	199	7.96	7.90	8.2
Colby University	88	3.52	3.70	2.8
Columbia College	80	3.20	3.15	3.4
Cornell University	14	.56	.6	.4
Dartmouth College	165	6.60	7.45	3.2
De Pauw University	145	5.80	5.60	6.6
Harvard University	267	10.68	8.70	18.6
Johns Hopkins University	23	1.53 [15 yrs.]	1.30 [10 yrs.]	2
Lake Forest University	41	2.73 [15 "]	2.10 [10 "]	4
Oberlin College	201	8.04	8.45	6.4
Princeton College	490	19.60	19.70	19.2
Trinity College, Hartford	172	6.88	6.35	9
Tufts College	36	1.44	1.25	2.2
Tulane University	5	.50 [10 yrs.]	.20 [5 yrs.]	.8
University of California	8	.32	.35	.2
" " Iowa	43	1.72	1.75	1.6
" " Kansas	12	.57 [21 yrs.]	.62 [16 yrs.]	.4
" " Michigan	59	2.77 [22 "]	2.85	1 [2 yrs.]
" " Minnesota	28	1.33 [21 "]	.87 [16 yrs.]	2.8
" " the State of Missouri	7	.28	.35	....
" " Pennsylvania	116	4.64	4.50	5.2
" " the South	19	.90 [21 yrs.]	.87 [16 yrs.]	1
Wesleyan University	248	9.92	10.40	8
Williams College	169	6.76	6.80	6.6
Yale University	233	9.32	9.30	9.4
Total A.B.'s of 27 colleges entering the Ministry	3279	131.16	130.25	134.8

The total number of men who had taken the degree of A.B. at these twenty-seven colleges and who entered the ministry were as follows for the last twenty-five years:

YEAR.	Number A.B.'s entering ministry.	YEAR.	Number A.B.'s entering ministry.	YEAR.	Number A.B.'s entering ministry.	YEAR.	Number A.B.'s entering ministry.
1869	123	1875	122	1881	121	1887	116
1870	145	1876	127	1882	122	1888	120
1871	133	1877	144	1883	127	1889	127
1872	163	1878	135	1884	122	1890	131
1873	122	1879	137	1885	113	1891	153
1874	144	1880	139	1886	130	1892	139
						1893	124

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TABLE II.

PERCENTAGE OF A.B.'S ENTERING THE MINISTRY.

COLLEGES.	Average per cent for 25 years.	Average per cent until 1889.	Average per cent for last 5 years.
Amherst College	21	25	7
Boston University	29 [17 years]	27 [12 years]	33
Bowdoin College	7	7	8
Brown University	18	19	17
Colby University	22	25	11
Columbia College	7	7	8
Cornell University	6	8	2
Dartmouth College	12	13	7
De Pauw University	26	24	30
Harvard University	5	5	7
Johns Hopkins University	6 [15 years]	7 [10 years]	5
Lake Forest University	73 [15 "]	80 [10 "]	60
Oberlin College	31	33	24
Princeton College	20	21	15
Trinity College, Hartford	38	36	47
Tufts College	13	12	19
Tulane University	10 [10 years]	10 [5 years]	10
University of California	4	5	2
" " Iowa	16	16	14
" " Kansas	4 [21 years]	5 [16 years]	1
" " Michigan	3 [22 "]	4	[2 years] 1
" " Minnesota	4 [22 "]	4 [16 years]	4
" " the State of Missouri	4	5	....
" " Pennsylvania	22	20	30
" " the South	19 [21 years]	18 [16 years]	22
Wesleyan University	29	32	16
Williams College	16	17	10
Yale University	7	7	6
Percentage of A.B.'s of 27 colleges entering the ministry	13+	14+	11−

The percentage of the A.B.'s of these twenty-seven colleges that entered the ministry for each year during these twenty-five years is as follows:

YEAR.	Percentage of A.B.'s entering ministry.	YEAR.	Percentage of A.B.'s entering ministry.	YEAR.	Percentage of A.B.'s entering ministry.	YEAR.	Percentage of A.B.'s entering ministry.
1869	19 −	1875	16+	1881	12 −	1887	11 −
1870	20+	1876	15+	1882	13 −	1888	11+
1871	18+	1877	16 −	1883	12 −	1889	12+
1872	22 −	1878	15+	1884	12 −	1890	11 −
1873	16+	1879	14+	1885	11+	1891	12 −
1874	18 −	1880	15 −	1886	12+	1892	10+
						1893	9 −

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Methodist), De Pauw (Methodist), Lake Forest (Presbyterian), Oberlin (Congregationalist), Trinity (Protestant Episcopal), Tufts (Universalist). These six colleges, taken as a group, contribute more than 30 per cent of their graduates to the ministry, and in the last five years have more than maintained this proportion. All but Oberlin show a slight increase, and Oberlin but a slight decrease. Yet the absolute contribution from the entire group is but small. Lake Forest gives in some years 100 per cent of its graduates to the ministry, but this means in absolute numbers only three men a year. The groups of six, taken together, have sent, for twenty-five years, 26 Bachelors of Arts into the profession per annum, or less than five each, and for the last five years 31, or a little more than five each.

A fourth group consists of what we may call the New England colleges, founded, for the most part, primarily in the interest of religious training, but of late years greatly broadening their range of instruction, and fruitful in many branches of liberal learning. Into this group fall Amherst, Bowdoin, Brown, Colby, Dartmouth, Wesleyan, Williams. Of these, Bowdoin, Brown, Colby, Wesleyan, and Williams just about hold their own in absolute numbers, sending in all 28 men into the ministry in each year up to 1889, and 27 men in each of the last five years. The other colleges of this group, Amherst and Dartmouth, show a marked decline in this professional service: in the case of Amherst from 16 to 5, and in that of Dartmouth from 7 to 3. The decline in the case of Amherst is a striking feature of the tables. In 1869 nearly one-half of her graduates entered the ministry; in the last five years only 7 per cent have enlisted,—a fact which some friends of the institution will welcome as an indication of greater breadth of purpose, and some will regret as a departure from the earlier tradition.

Lastly, we may group together the institutions which are generally recognized as the more important Northern universities. These are Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Pennsylvania, Princeton, and Yale. Of these, Johns Hopkins may be left out of account, having trained in fifteen years but 23 ministers, or an average of less than two each year. Columbia College also has been a very moderate contributor, with an aggregate of 80 ministers in twenty-five years. The University of Pennsylvania, on the other hand, has had an exceptional history. The percentage of her Bachelors of Arts entering the ministry is extraordinarily high, and rises in the last five years from 20 per cent to 30 per cent. The importance of this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proportion, however, is lessened by the very limited number of A. B. degrees conferred by this university. Thus, in 1892, 33 per cent of her Bachelors of Arts entered the profession, but the actual number was but five. Judged, then, by proportional figures, the position of Pennsylvania is almost unique; but judged by actual figures her contribution for twenty-five years is less than that of Williams, Dartmouth, or De Pauw. There remain the three institutions which, on the whole, represent the most varied constituencies and possess the widest national reputation. Fortunately for the country, these three universities, Princeton, Yale, and Harvard, maintain, in the matter we are now testing, as in most other problems of administration and aim, widely different methods and ideals. It is therefore interesting to inquire into the apparent effect of these differing methods on the supply of ministers. The first and most striking fact which meets such an inquiry is the large and continuous contribution of Princeton. For the last twenty-five years she has trained not fewer than 19 ministers each year,—a number which remains almost precisely the same in the earlier and the later years of the period. Owing to the great growth of the college, however, there has been a decline in proportional numbers, from 21 per cent of her graduates in the first twenty years to 15 per cent in the last five years; yet even with this decline the figures for Princeton stand, on the whole, quite alone in the list. Yale, on the other hand, has contributed for the whole period but nine men a year to the profession, or less than one-half the quota of Princeton; while, as in the case of Princeton, Yale's figure remains constant throughout. Thus, in the last five years, through the great growth of Yale College, her proportional contribution to the ministry has dropped from 7 per cent of her graduates to 6 per cent. Meantime the story of Harvard in this connection shows interesting relations with both those of Princeton and that of Yale. Taking the twenty-five years together, Harvard is to be ranked with Yale, the annual enlistment being 10 at Harvard and 9 at Yale. During the last five years, however, the Harvard figures rather more than double, advancing from 8 to 18; so that, while for the whole period of twenty-five years Harvard has trained but a few more ministers than Yale, in the last five years she has trained scarcely fewer than Princeton, and just double as many as Yale. Moreover, while in both Yale and Princeton the proportionate figures decline, at Harvard, in spite of her growth from a class of 212 in 1889 to 283 in 1893, the proportion of her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

graduates becoming ministers has advanced from 5 per cent to 7 per cent of each class. I am here dealing with facts alone, and deny myself much speculation about causes, but the transition in this case cannot be interpreted without reference to another movement. The change of attitude toward the ministry at Harvard University is coincident with the first years of the voluntary system in religion. The Harvard figures practically double from the year when this system began to have its full effect, and no one who is familiar with the life of Harvard University during the last five years can doubt that the increase of its graduates seeking the ministry is at least in some degree a result of regarding religion as a privilege and opportunity rather than an obligation and discipline.

If, finally, in this limited inquiry, we sum up the present situation in the different colleges, we observe that in the last five years Tulane and Minnesota have kept their proportionate contribution practically fixed; and the following show a proportionate decline: Amherst, Brown, Colby, Cornell, Dartmouth, Johns Hopkins, Lake Forest, Oberlin, Princeton, California, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Wesleyan, Williams, Yale; and the following a proportionate advance: Boston, Bowdoin, De Pauw, Columbia, Harvard, Trinity, Tufts, Pennsylvania, University of the South. The largest relative decline is shown by Lake Forest; the largest relative advance by Trinity: the largest positive decline is shown by Amherst; the largest positive advance by Harvard.

Such seems to be the evidence of a few American colleges as to the movement of their relation to the ministry. There remains, however, another point of view from which the whole subject may be considered, as it were, from the opposite side. Suppose we turn from the colleges to the theological schools and consider their present condition. How do they stand in relation to the colleges? Are they recruited from the uneducated classes? Is the standard of their scholarship inferior to that of other professional schools, or is it absolutely declining? It is of course to be admitted that there are many schools for the ministry, as there are for the professions of law or medicine, which are expressly designed for non-academic students; and it is of course also true that many students pass from these schools of popular instruction to faithful and effective service. But if we turn to the more conspicuous schools of the country, we shall find that their academic standard and demands indicate a relation to the colleges which may surprise some critics of the profession.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The following table presents the condition of twelve theological schools, selected only as being most easily within reach, and reported through the extreme kindness of official representatives.

Theological Schools.	Average per cent A.B.'s 10 years.	Average per cent A.B.'s last 5 years.
Andover Theological School	77	78
Boston University School of Theology	54	53
Episcopal Theological School (Cambridge)	72	78
General Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church	79	74
Hartford Theological Seminary	82	78
Harvard Divinity School	74	72
Newton Theological School	57	49
Oberlin Theological School	54	45
Princeton Theological School	87	86
Rochester Theological Seminary (English Department)	62	68
Union Theological Seminary	88	82
Yale Divinity School	79	77

The average percentage of Bachelors of Arts in each school is given for the last ten years, and again for the last five years. Each student's name may be counted more than once, the figures representing not the number of separate students, but the general condition of each school in each year. The computation omits all other degrees except the Bachelors of Arts, as well as all who have entered from institutions not conferring degrees; and the net result indicates that for these ten years about 70 per cent of the students of these schools were college graduates. This means, as a matter of fact, that these schools of theology are practically administered on the post-graduate level of instruction. Their standard of antecedent education is undoubtedly higher than can be claimed for almost any school of law or medicine in this country. The best theological schools are still the best representatives of a thoroughly educated profession.

Finally, one other question presents itself, which should be of extreme interest both to the theological schools and the colleges. It is the question of the sources of supply from which the Bachelors of Arts in the theological schools are received. How is it that the ministry is reinforced by educated men? From what colleges do the seminaries draw their supply? Are the sources much the same from year to year, and in what proportion do the large and the small institutions contribute? An inquiry of this kind, extending over a series of years, would be instructive for any theological school to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make, and two specimen cases have been carefully analyzed for the purposes of this paper by officers of the schools. One is the case of a large school, Union Seminary; and the other that of a small school—Hartford. In both cases the total number of Bachelors of Arts has been computed for each year. From 1883 to 1893 each student's name therefore, as before, is likely to be reckoned more than once. Each of these cases gives the same general evidence as to the movement of Bachelors of Arts toward the schools of theology. In the first place, both cases show that their main sources of supply are practically fixed. Union Seminary, for instance, since 1883, has had on its roll 1,340 Bachelors of Arts, representing no less than 122 colleges; but of these students 798, or more than one-half, have been drawn from only 16 institutions, or about one-eighth of the whole number of colleges. Hartford, in the same period, has instructed 444 Bachelors of Arts, drawn from 43 colleges; but 232 of these students, or more than one-half, have come from 4 institutions, or less than one-tenth. Moreover, Union Seminary in 1893 received 76 of its 111 Bachelors of Arts from the same colleges which in 1883 gave it 67 out of its 116 Bachelors. Thus the chief sources of supply remain on the whole constant from year to year. But on the other hand, both cases disclose a great number of subsidiary sources of supply, which are often of great importance. In 1883 Union Seminary derived its 116 Bachelors of Arts from no less than 50 colleges, and in each of the ten years since that date it has added about 7 new institutions to its list of sources, each contributing to it on the average about one student a year. The largest contributor to Union Seminary during the period considered has been Lafayette College (112 students in eleven years); and important reinforcements have come from Rutgers, from the University of the City of New York, from the University of Vermont, from Wabash College, from Park College, and from Marysville College. All these institutions should be included in any full examination of the college tendencies. Much the same story is true of Hartford. In 1883 its Bachelors of Arts came from 12 colleges, but in the last ten years it has extended its constituency at the rate of 3 colleges a year. Some of its earlier sources of supply have greatly declined. Amherst, which once sent it 20 men, now sends it but 3; Dartmouth, which in 1883 contributed 10 students, in 1893 sends but 5. Harvard College, on the other hand, has become within this period a considerable contributor to various divinity schools; to Yale (32 men in seven years), to Hartford

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(25 men in ten years), and to Union (13 men in ten years); while at the same time the Divinity School of Harvard University shows a growth from 5 Bachelors of Arts of Harvard College in 1883 to 18 in 1893. Thus, an inquiry into the sources of supply of the theological schools, while it shows the importance of the large and constant contributors, discloses also the significance to the university of the constantly increasing number and humbler activity of the many obscurer colleges which make their small offerings to the higher education. These little rills refresh each year the stream which would, if it depended on its main sources alone, run a meagre course. Each year the seminaries find the range of their work enlarged by a new constituency from these less conspicuous colleges, which by these gifts to the Christian ministry go far to justify the sacrifices and the public spirit which they represent.

Looking back, then, on the data thus collected, the general impression they may give to one who cares for theological education seems to be one of reasonable satisfaction. It is, indeed, true that the proportion of Bachelors of Arts entering the ministry has somewhat declined in the last quarter of a century; but this decline, after all, is less than might be anticipated, and it is perhaps not greater than other professions have experienced. It is true, also, that some of the colleges seem to be failing as sources of supply, but, on the other hand, some are gaining in volume. Moreover, the gain appears sometimes to be most marked where the college is in the midst of modern life and interests, and the loss appears in some instances most decided in some of the most sheltered institutions. It would seem, therefore, that among the most favorable conditions for making ministers in times like ours are those where the college is most open to freedom of research, and in close relation to the needs and problems of modern society. There are many influences which still threaten the self-respect of the ministry: a pernicious system of indiscriminate aid in many seminaries, a tradition of sentimentalism in the profession, and an increasing attraction to other careers. In this state of things it is a satisfaction to believe that the best theological schools still maintain the standard of a scholarly profession, and that the call to the ministry is still heard above the noises of the time, and is still obeyed by educated young men.

FRANCIS G. PEABODY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRESENT INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY.

I AM asked to deal with the causes of discontent and their true significance; with the possible lines of improvement; with the effect of the factory system; with the existence of class feeling and with the dangers to liberty—if there are any—in existing combinations of capital in trusts or corporations, or combinations of men in trades-unions and other associations.

This is rather a broad field to be covered in a Review article. In dealing with it I must appeal mainly to the reader's imagination, for I can only make a sketch; and I shall, to get the proper perspective, go back for a moment almost to the beginning of the institutions from which our own have been evolved.

Under the feudal system as it was in early days among the Teutonic races of Europe from whom we are derived, the classes protected the masses in a more or less genuine manner, demanding in return their feudal service. Our ancestors were of an independent type. They were not bound by the restrictions of any specially revealed religion, which possesses such an obstructive force in its effect upon those who are held by it. As time goes on, dogmatic theology possesses less and less hold upon the minds of their descendants. In these earlier days the merchant and the tradesman existed only in a few cities. Their prosperity was viewed with the utmost jealousy by the lords of the soil. They could not attain the possession of land outside the walls of their cities to any extent. They were not brought into direct relation with the masses of the peasants or the serfs who constituted the great body of the population. The factory system had as yet no existence. There was little or no interdependence of communities on each other.

Presently came the Crusades, promoting a wild enthusiasm among the higher classes, who were granted stay-laws in respect to their debts to the merchants; they were also permitted to mortgage their lands to the money-lenders of the cities in order to raise the outfit with which to go on the Crusade. Under the influence of this so-called religious enthusiasm, they gathered their dependents and men-at-arms

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about them, and went marching away to the Holy Land, where they conveniently left their bones in very large numbers,—thus perhaps rendering the best service that they could give at that time to the cause of civilization. The hold of their class on land, which had been attained by means of force, was greatly diminished or weakened in this period, while the common men-at-arms brought back from the far East the knowledge of the cultivation of maize into southern Europe, where it is still grown under the name of Turkish corn. They also brought back the art of weaving and dyeing, especially silks. They learned the fine art of making steel, of which the finest type was the Damascus blade. In southern Europe the finest type was the Toledo blade, made under the instruction of the Moors, whose exclusion from Spain carried away so much of art, of literature, and of industry.

Subsequently came the great invention of gunpowder. This was the greatest equalizer of conditions ever brought into the world. It rendered the unarmored man the equal in force of him who had previously held dominion over all, and it enabled the development of mining in a way that had never been conceived. Under these conditions the struggle of the masses against the classes began. It has not yet ended,—especially in Germany, where the rule of blood and iron is still imposed by the military caste which dominates the Empire.

Glance now at the condition of the English during the Wars of the Roses. The lords and the knights, who were the privileged class,—even the bishops—battled with each other, more than decimating their own number in single battles. They were attended, it is true, by their squires and their retainers, but these were relatively few in number compared to those who quietly remained working in the fields or laying the foundation of modern England in the workshop, presently in the factory. Progress ensued the faster the so-called higher classes of that type diminished in number by their own contests among themselves. It was the non-survival of those who were not fit to rule—the suicide (sometimes, in a tournament, the duicide) of the unfit.

It is well to remember that the higher classes in England in recent years have been almost wholly recruited from among the men of affairs, not from the men-at-arms. England owes its wealth and its present measure of welfare to the former class.

It is only when we come to the latter part of the last century that we stand at the very inception of the factory system, with which we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are now to deal. Before we take up that question let us ask ourselves to what was the strength of England due in the conduct of the great Napoleonic struggle. England, with an audacity in inverse proportion to her number, then less in the whole kingdom than ten millions, had vainly attempted, after "the manner of a bulldog with confused ideas," to keep dominion over our ancestors, three millions in number, of a similar type, occupying the maritime border of a whole continent, and as obstinate as their fathers had been before them. What an absurd bit of audacity that struggle now appears to us! Yet, in spite of its absurdity, this attempt to hold the armed control over the American Colonies might have been successful. Had it been so, it would have been owing to the folly of our revered patriot fathers who controlled the finances of the Colonies for the first four years, and who, with ideas as muddled as those of many of the present day, nearly ruined the country with fiat money. It was the French and Dutch loan, negotiated in coin, that saved the patriot cause from disaster. There is always a material element, or an element of the commissariat, underlying success or failure in war. It was the rapid concentration of the German troops by great forced marches, each corps arriving at the right place at the right time, by which the French were conquered in the Franco-Prussian war. That ability to march may be attributed to the German army sausage, without which the German rifles would probably have failed to be effective at the right time and at the right place.

I have put the question, What was it that gave to England, with her small population, such a dominating power? Was it not the very factory system with which we are struggling? Was it not the application of steam to power? Was it not the invention of the blast-furnace and the development of coal and iron? Were not the great mechanical forces the source of the energy which enabled England to establish her world-wide commerce, by which she obtained the wealth that enabled her to subsidize European states and armies, and to fight Napoleon with money more than she did with men? Did she not buy the Hessians with whom she tried to conquer us? Without that English money-power Napoleon would never have been conquered. Pitt was a disciple of Adam Smith. He had planned a reform-bill of a very broad scope. He had planned methods for the relief of Great Britain from the restrictions upon commerce which for centuries had deprived her of a part of her true force, so that throughout the seventeenth century the Dutch excelled her. All these plans for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the amelioration of the condition of the people and of commerce he was obliged to give up in order to carry on the great struggle with Napoleon. Why was it necessary? What did Napoleon himself aim at? At one time, quite early in the struggle, had he not reconstructed the map of Europe on far better lines than had ever existed before or have ever been established since? Had he not then united most of the States of Germany under the Confederation of the Rhine? Had he not excluded Austria from Italy? Had he not cause for many of the boasts in his grandiloquent addresses to the soldiers?

What might have been the history of Europe had Napoleon, instead of attempting to destroy the trade and commerce of England even as late as the Berlin and Milan decrees, simply recognized the fact that all nations and states are interdependent, and acted on the principle that in the great commerce among nations all men serve each others' needs? This principle was sustained even by his own great Minister of Finance, against whose counsel he adopted what was called the Continental system for destroying the commerce of Great Britain. What might have been the history of the present century if Napoleon had been as truly enlightened about the affairs of commerce as he was in the work which he did in establishing the French law on the basis of what is known as the *Code Napoléon*, or had he applied the same intelligence which he exercised in bringing men into place and power without regard to birth or previous condition, and in establishing true lines in laying out the map of Europe?

Suppose he had co-operated with Pitt in an enlightened commercial system. There would then have been no restoration of the Bourbons in France or in Italy. There would then have been no renewal of Austrian tyranny. There would then have been no disaster at Leipsic; no French Revolution of 1830. There might then have been no later Austro-Prussian war. There might then have been no Franco-Prussian war. The greater part of the burden of debt which now oppresses Europe would not have been incurred. He might then, in co-operation with Austria, in place of moving upon Moscow, have moved upon Constantinople, and shoved the unspeakable Turk out of Europe. Modern civilization, with the benefits of commerce, might have been a century in advance of what it now is. Had he established peaceful relations of mutual service after he had put men from the masses above the classes, there would now be no oppressive war-taxes as barriers between European countries, by which the very life-blood of nations is drawn away to support four million men who are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now worse than wasting their lives in camps and barracks, while the women are to-day doing the scavenger-work of the streets, winding coal up from the mines because woman power is cheaper than steam power, mixing the mortar for the building trades, and living under conditions, even in the rich city of Frankfort, so abject that the water in which one man's sausage is boiled can be sold to him who has no sausage, to give a little flavor to a starvation diet.

But this was not to be. Napoleon was conquered by the English money-power. That power originated and rested upon coal, iron, and steel, and upon the mechanism of the factory and the workshop. That paramount British power has culminated. The dominion of coal, iron, and steel has come to our land. Upon us now rests the responsibility for the use of this power. Shall we exert it in the cause of peace, good will, and plenty, by promoting the interdependence of nations, or shall we waste it in building ships of war bearing the disgraceful name of "commerce-destroyers"?

I have in this way tried to lead up to the true aspect of the questions with which I started out. One may now ask, What has been the greatest change in the condition of society which has been affected by these forces? Do I go too far in my appeal to the reader's imagination if I say that it has been the elimination of friction in what Carey called the "societary circulation" of commodities? These are long words of which I am not fond. I will put the case in a plainer way:

All that we can do is to move something. We can make nothing. We produce or lead forth. We could move no trains if the wheels did not stick to the rail. We could not move the wheels of commerce at all if there were no friction due to gravitation. There could be no movement without resistance, and yet all that we do is to apply science so as to overcome resistance. By way of resistance comes development. Through the action of these great moving forces all men have become interdependent. There is no such thing as independence. I hold in my hand the symbol of an almighty dollar. It is tied to the standard of value of the world's commerce by redemption, and is convertible on demand. This dollar is almighty in a sense of which few men have any conception. I am led, through my food "fad," to which I have given so much attention, to cite the work of the almighty dollar in proof that in "the societary circulation of commodities" all that we do is to move something. We make nothing. Distance has been sunk in a fraction of a cent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a ton a mile, and the world has become one great neighborhood. I can change the dollar into dimes, nickels, and cents, and, passing around through a series of shops in Boston, I first buy four pounds of the coarser but more nutritious parts of beef. Where did it come from? From the plains of Nebraska or Texas, brought through the packing-house in Chicago to within a few rods of the door of my office. I buy a few little bones of the breast of mutton, brought from Kentucky; a pound and a half of fish from the Grand Banks; and a half a pound of bacon or pork from Illinois; a half a pound of butter or a pound of butterine from Michigan. I go to another shop and I buy four pounds of flour or meal (from which I can make a pound of bread a day) that has been brought from Minnesota or Dakota or even from Oregon or California. I buy a pound of sugar produced by the peasants of Germany in the beet-fields. I buy twenty pounds of vegetables which may have come from the maritime provinces of Canada or from the far-away Southern States, according to the season. I buy some oranges from Florida, some grapes from Ohio. I add a little tea from China or Ceylon, a little coffee from Java or South America, salt from Liverpool, pepper from Sumatra, spice from the Spice Islands, and I have expended the almighty dollar. I have placed on my table twenty-six pounds of well-balanced, varied, and nutritious food material, which I can then convert, under a flour barrel made into an oven, into the most appetizing and nutritious food with the heat developed by two cents' worth of oil from Pennsylvania or Ohio and it will give me adequate and complete nutrition for one week—three full meals a day—twenty-one meals for one almighty dollar. That dollar's worth of food, if I bought it to-morrow in Boston, would have been brought more than a thousand miles from the far-away sources that I have named.

This is the beneficent aspect of that great power of competition by which men are compelled to co-operate and to serve each other's needs whether they will or not. Yet there is discontent. There ought to be discontent. There are wrongs affecting this man who earns a dollar a day. There are wrongs for which society as a whole must be held responsible; wrongs due to putting ignorant men in places of power, who tamper with the standard of value; wrongs due to putting selfish men in places of power, who pervert the force of taxation to private ends; wrongs due to those who, by neglect of their political duties, permit cities to be misgoverned and legislators to be suborned. The discontent which does to some extent pervade great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masses of people is a reflection of these wrongs, which those who are affected by them know not how to remedy. If men of intelligence fail to recognize the fact that a part of the discontent which now actuates great masses of people is well grounded, then the remedy may be a very rough one, but it will be complete.

The railway-wrecker may have laid his maleficent hand upon the railway stocks and bonds of the country. He may have perverted a trust so as to make the fortunes of those who connive at the wrong, and so as to mar the welfare of those whose trusts he betrayed. But those stocks and bonds are but loaded dice with which gamblers steal from each other in such transactions; not of course in all. Whatever happens to the stock and bonds, the railway service itself must do its work in the service of the community and under a higher law of competition than any which can be evaded,—the competition of product with product in the great markets. The railways are compelled to do the maximum service at the minimum of charge, lest there should be no work to be done that would justify the existence of the tracks.

Under the influence of this great force the charges made on all the railways of the United States have been reduced from time to time ever since the service had an existence. In the period that elapsed from 1865 to 1869 the rates were considered very low and the service was constantly improving, and becoming greater and greater. Yet, low as these rates then were, had all the railways of the United States during the last ten years been able to make a similar charge for their service, they would have earned each year for ten years a thousand million dollars ($1,000,000,000) more than they did earn. The gross difference between what the railways of the United States did earn in the last ten years, and what they would have received at the rates of 1865 to 1869, comes to over ten thousand million dollars ($10,000,000,000), and that is a greater sum than the market value of all the stocks and bonds of all the railways even before the panic depressed them. The service which these railways rendered to each of us yesterday was to move sixty pounds of food, fuel, or fabric over one hundred miles at a charge of less than three cents. Without that service modern society could not exist.

I have referred to these matters of past history in order to lead up to the conditions of the present in our own country. The paramount control of all the imperial deposits of iron ores, of copper, and of coal, now rests with us. The development of the factory system,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which has gone to such an extreme in Great Britain as to destroy the balance of occupations, to the end that more than half her supply of food must be drawn from far distant regions, has brought Great Britain into rather a dangerous condition. Her power to supply her people with food, and with the materials—mainly cotton and wool—on which so large a body of people work, depends upon her ability to sell her finished fabrics in all parts of the world; and that power of sale originated in iron, steel, and coal.

There are but two groups of machine-using nations which have as yet applied the power of metal and steam in any considerable measure. One group consists of France, the Netherlands, and Germany; their supplies of ore and coal are wholly insufficient to meet any considerable increased demand. Regarding the area of both countries, France is fertile, but Germany quite the reverse; this great body of people can barely supply themselves with their own food.

The only group which has applied the powers of coal and iron in fullest measure consists of the English-speaking people, of whom we are the larger body. The British group is in fact poorly endowed either with coal or ores of the right qualities. The supply of fine ores for making steel comes mainly from Spain and other foreign sources. Coal may not be approaching exhaustion, but is drawn from excessive depths at steadily increasing cost.

The only machine-using nation which possesses the power of producing food, fuel, and iron in excess of any possible want for generations to come, is our own. It follows that, whatever may be the delay or obstruction, this country will become within a very short time the greatest agricultural, manufacturing, shipbuilding, and commercial country in the world. As soon as these forces are allowed to take their natural and normal development, rapid progress will occur, but the forced or stimulated development of special branches of industry by legislation has brought many of the very evils upon us with which I was called upon to deal in this lecture. The collective or factory system has been forced to an unnatural development in many directions, notably in the arts to which the term "manufacturing" is apt to be limited, namely, the production of iron and steel, the textile arts, the working of metals, glass, pottery, and a few other articles which in fact constitute a small part of our manufactures.

Strikes are more apt to occur in these arts than in any others. These arts themselves and the strikes are brought into conspicuous notice by constant agitation. It may seem surprising that the col-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lective or factory system of work gives employment at this time to not exceeding ten in each hundred of all who are occupied for gain. More than half of our working population is devoted to agriculture, which is of necessity individual, or not collective to any extent. Here and there, there is a great field of manufacture, as of wheat in the far Northwest, but the single crop is fading out; even the production of wheat is coming into rotation in a varied system, as the great cotton plantations have yielded to varied crops and to a more intensive, or to an individual, system of cultivation. Eighteen per cent of all who are occupied for gain are engaged in professional and personal service, which is of necessity individual in its quality. Ten and a half per cent are occupied in trade and transportation, and while there are some great combinations in the railway service, that bring a small number into a union, the work itself requires individual aptitude and does not in any degree correspond to the collective or factory system. There remain to be considered the mechanic arts, manufactures, and mining. By far the larger portion in these classes are the individual mechanics, each working with personal aptitude as an artisan or as a craftsman rather than as an operative.

In the last analysis, if we put into the category of the collective or factory system all in blast-furnaces and steel-works—all the textile operatives, all who are occupied in making clothing, all the machinists and all others who can be brought together under single roofs, each doing only one part of the work, they number less than ten in a hundred. It is among these that we have to cope with most of our present difficulties. This collective work is necessary because the textile worker, for instance, performs a hundredfold more work than the individual spinner or weaver. Three persons, mainly women, in each hundred persons, supply us with all our fabrics for clothing in excessive abundance. If all this work were done on the individual principle, and the effort were made to give us an equal supply to that which we now enjoy, there would be no time left for anything else. The benefits are therefore plain. The evils consist in our long hours of work of a very monotonous kind, to some extent destructive to individualism.

Our present difficulties are not to be attributed to organization of labor, but rather to lack of organization of labor. If I am rightly informed, the total number registered in all the trades-unions is but a few hundred thousand. The organization known as the Knights of Labor in its palmiest day reached a considerable number, but it has almost faded out. There are now at least eighteen to twenty million

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men and two to three million women belonging to the ranks of labor, by far the greater part of whom are working on in isolation. What is most needed is that the representatives of each of the different arts shall be organized, in order that through organization each union may come to comprehend the terms of its own existence and the conditions under which its own work must be done. I even welcome the Farmers' Alliance, and the Grangers, and all that: anything better than stagnation or inertia. The farmers are learning the true lesson. The cheap-jacks who first misled them are being thrown out of the ranks. The strong men, who for a long time were themselves at first deluded as to what they could do, are learning how to lead. Step by step the organization of labor will proceed. The terms of admission to the trades-unions will become, as they were in the guilds, the possession of skill, aptitude, character, and merit. True unions will cease to attempt to reduce all their members to the dead level of mediocrity, or else all men above mediocrity will leave them and form new organizations by which the inferior ones will be beaten out of existence.

If we explore the deeper currents now actuating great bodies of men, we may see that these forces of intelligence are surely working either to the destruction of the labor organizations that are trying to work against the nature of things; or else by development they are bringing the labor organizations to a true perception of what the rights of labor really are. On the other hand, I think there is a rapidly growing perception on the part of the possessors of property as to what the duties of capital are.

Nor have I any fears of trusts. They are of two kinds. One is a mere combination of very able men, who, having obtained the control of certain enterprises, combine and hold it by doing the work for society at less cost than it was ever done before, and at less cost than it could be done except by such combination. And yet even these trusts may not be of long duration. The Standard Oil Company has worked so effectually that light is furnished us at less cost than any other important article of living, and, as I have said, a man can cook his week's supply of provisions with two cents' worth of Standard oil; yet even with that expenditure of energy I do not suppose more than five per cent—even if as much—of the real potential of the oil is converted into the work of cooking. There are other trusts and companies which are merely of a selfish order, often a fraud upon the community. Such combinations contain the seeds of their own dissolution, and may even promote—as strikes also often

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

promote—the completion of important inventions which might have been delayed for many years except for this incentive. I know of no textile art in which the mechanism is so crude or so far behind that of others as the making of cordage. A trust which would undertake to limit the products of that art and to confine it to existing inventions could have no permanent existence. There are many other trusts too numerous to mention; but I venture to say that there is not one from which any excess of profit is or can now be derived that is not at the mercy of some one or perhaps of a hundred inventors, by whom every process that the trust controls will be invented out of existence within the next ten years.

Of all the mechanism and the processes exhibited in the first World's Fair of 1851 there is scarcely a process that has not been displaced; hardly one bit of mechanism that has not gone to the scrap-heap of old metal. Of all that was exhibited in the Centennial of 1876 very few processes remain that have not been greatly changed at lessening cost; hardly a single bit of mechanism that would not be built in a far better way at far less cost to-day. The progress of science and invention in its effect upon capital is most destructive, substituting year by year more effective examples of capital at lessening cost, by means of which the labor cost of production is diminished and the rates of wages are augmented.

Leisure, which consists in the diligent and intelligent use of time by him who earns it, has become more and more within the control of intelligent men and women as the benefits of science and invention become distributed among the great mass of the people. It is difficult to conceive the increase in productive power that has been brought about in this country since the end of the Civil War. I know of no example that will prove the progress of general intelligence more conclusively than to cite the fact that the postal receipts of this country have increased from $14,000,000 in 1865 to $80,000,000 in 1892.

The true standing army of the United States—the only one on which we can rely for effective or useful service in the future—is the great body of teachers in our common schools, academies, and colleges. Their number has increased from 229,921 in 1872 to 377,000 in 1892. The appropriations for schools between these two periods have increased from $74,234,476 to $155,000,000, and yet how far short we are in our comprehension of the duty and the responsibility which now rest upon us!

There is a vision which will become a living truth. The barriers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which have separated the different groups of the English-speaking people are about to be thrown down. We shall all soon be reunited in the bonds of mutual service. We are the complement of each other; the one branch producing in abundance what the other lacks. When we are reunited in reciprocity of trade without obstruction, all the evil powers of the world must go down before us; but as yet we utterly fail to comprehend our responsibility. The false principle that commerce is aggressive, and to be dealt with as a war of industries, has even within two years been put into one of its most malignant forms. Three naval vessels of a new type have lately been tested for their speed. They cost $3,000,000 each. It costs $800,000 a year to maintain them. What are they good for? Nothing. What are they bad for? Everything. They are worthless even as cruisers, because they can carry but little coal. They are worthless even as battle-ships, because their armor is light. They are worthless for defence in our harbors. Their very name is a disgrace. They are called "commerce-destroyers." Their cost was about as great as the whole endowment of Harvard University. The annual cost of maintaining three of this vile type of piratical destroyers is more than the annual expenditure of Harvard University for all its beneficent services. Our danger does not consist now in trusts or trades-unions. It consists in such treason to the very liberty of which we boast as we have embodied in these vessels. I think this phase of ignorance, or worse, is but a passing cloud. This cloud has a golden hue of which we are beginning to comprehend the meaning. The contest in Washington is not about a few trifling dollars more or less in taxation; it is a contest with an evil influence in our body politic and a false conception of rights and duties.

All commerce is altruistic, otherwise it could have no existence. The most potent and malignant influence, which has caused more misery in the world than any false concept, except that of miscalled religion, is the error that so long has governed nearly all nations; the error that aggravated the Napoleonic contests; the error that still retains a powerful and baneful influence in our own land,—namely, that in commerce what one nation gains another loses. If we can eradicate that false idea from legislation, almost all the evils that can be cured by legislation will vanish. That is the true issue now pending. It is a part of the great struggle for freedom.

EDWARD ATKINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RESULTS OF THE PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS.

HISTORY has scarcely any contrast to present greater or more instructive than that between "the light of burning heretics," which threw its glare over the enterprise of Columbus, and the purer splendor of a parliament of religions, which cast its radiance, four centuries afterward, over the Columbian anniversary. The human race has been wofully divided by national and other antipathies, especially by those of religion. It is remarkable, therefore, that the first universal council ever held, the first parliament of man, was a religious convention. The world appears to be determined to regard the parliament of religions as vastly significant. To Bishop Coxe, of Western New York, an earnest foe of this congress, it is still "one of the most serious events of the kind in the history of humanity, since the wise men from the east came to the cradle of Bethlehem." Castelar writes that, "from the beginning of the world until to-day, history has never recorded an event so momentous as this union, under one roof and one leadership and for one purpose, of the clergy of the world." A representative voice from Hindustan,—the "Indian Mirror" of Calcutta,—regards the parliament as "the crowning work of the nineteenth century," and "the flower of the tree of religion which mankind has so long watered and pruned." Count D'Alviella, of Brussels, regards it as a fact of great importance "that the programme of the congress was accepted by confessions so diverse and numerous, and that these were drawn to meet on a footing of equality."[1] To Professor Emilio Comba, of Rome, it seemed like reviving the spectacle of the ancient Pantheon, where the priests of many faiths met with a smile, not of cunning, but of courtesy and tolerance. And President Martin writes from the Imperial University of Peking that "it is now evident that the greatest thing at the World's Fair was the parliament of religions, which will be remembered when the marvels of machinery are forgotten."

Though the Congress in Chicago has had many prophecies in

[1] The equality acknowledged was "parliamentary," not "doctrinal."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

literature and many preparations in history, it was, as Rev. M. J. Savage has said, "the first really ecumenical meeting the world has ever seen." Every great event is the flower of all the ages which have preceded it, but the special preparations for this meeting in Chicago were: the almost universal spread of Christian missions; the rise and study of comparative religion; the wide use of the English language, making such a conference possible; international facilities for travel; ample religious freedom in America, where church and state are separated; the attractive opportunity afforded by a world's exposition; and much hard work extending over more than three years. A broad-minded lawyer of Chicago, Mr. Charles C. Bonney, is entitled to the great and lasting honor of having originated and carried to success, in spite of numerous obstacles, the entire *scheme of the world's congresses of 1893*. *The parliament of religions* was one of more than two hundred of these conventions, and, according to Mr. Bonney, "the splendid crown" of the series.

With the great peace-bell at the fair, tolling, as many hoped, the death-knell to intolerance; with the rabbis of Israel praying at that hour in all lands that the name of Jehovah might be reverenced over all the earth; with representatives of ten religions gathered beneath one roof; and with a Catholic Cardinal repeating the universal prayer of the world's Saviour, the parliament opened on the 11th of September, 1893. It was indeed a meeting of brotherhood, where "the Brahmin forgot his caste and the Catholic was chiefly conscious of his catholicity;" and where, in the audience, "the variety of interests, faiths, ranks, and races, was as great as that found on the platform." As the representatives of China, Russia, Germany, Hindustan, Sweden and Norway, Greece, France, Africa, the United States, and the all-clasping Empire of Great Britain, from England to New Zealand, uttered their thoughts and feelings, multitudes entered anew into the spirit of the Nazarene Prophet, who seemed always to include the whole world in His purpose and affection.

Professor Toy, of Harvard, has noted the physical difficulties of bringing such a parliament together, and he shows that it might easily have been a ludicrous and melancholy failure. The promoters of the plan were surprised at their own success, though the representation of the world's faiths was less complete and imposing than they had endeavored to achieve. The absence of representatives of Hindu Mohammedanism was deplored. President Miller, of Madras, who was the chairman's chief counselor, despaired for a time of securing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any Hindu representation at Chicago. Still the religious life of India spoke through representatives of nearly all its leading systems. Through an address by Vivekananda, and elaborate papers by Professor D'Vivedi and S. P. Aiyangar, different types of Hinduism were presented; Narasima, a graduate of the Christian College at Madras, criticised Christian missions; Laksmi Narain, of Lahore, spoke for the Arya Somaj; Gandhi, the acute Bombay lawyer, for Jainism; Mozoomdar and Nagarkar described with great eloquence the principles of the Brahmo Somaj; while Miss Sorabji, Rev. Maurice Phillips, Rev. R. A. Hume, Rev. T. E. Slater, and Rev. T. J. Scott (these last two through papers), spoke for Christianity in India.

Buddhism addressed the parliament through more than a dozen voices, Ceylonese, Japanese, and Siamese, including that of a Siamese prince; the religions of China were treated in seven different papers, the most elaborate of which was by Pung Quang Yu, Secretary of the Chinese Legation; Zoroastrianism was described in two excellent essays; Mohammedanism in four addresses; Shintoism in two; Judaism in twelve; and Christianity—Greek, Latin, Lutheran, Anglican, Reformed, Liberal, New Church—in nearly a hundred. Although much that passed for Oriental religion was a reflection of Christian truth and European philosophy, still the Oriental speakers were, on the whole, fairly representative of the higher ideas of their own faiths, if not of the popular religions. The results accomplished surpassed the popular expectations. Prof. Max Müller, who would have been present had he thought the dream was to be realized, regards the parliament as "one of the most encouraging signs of the times, the first friendly meeting and mutual recognition of all the religions of the world."

It would have been easy to defeat the objects of this meeting by making it chiefly a scientific gathering. But the purpose was not to call together the specialists in comparative religion, to produce learned and critical essays. Such a proceeding would have killed the parliament. While scholarship was everywhere apparent, technical scholarship was not made supremely prominent, and, according to one participant, "the peculiar charm of this meeting consisted in this, that it did not carry with it the predominant smell of the lamp." The parliament was not expected to furnish new facts and ideas to life-long students of comparative religion, but it did something quite as important by drawing popular attention to this vital theme,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and by giving the world such a demonstration of its unity and such evidences of brotherhood as had never before been witnessed.

The historian who attempts any adequate review of what the world has said of this meeting is troubled by an embarrassment of riches. The comments which have already reached the Chairman would fill more than four thousand pages like those on which this article is printed. According to one religious journal, "when the parliament adjourned, it really began its permanent sessions. Its utterances have continued to echo around the huge whispering-gallery of the world." The study of these criticisms will some day be an important chapter in the progress of comparative religion. By Professor Headland, of the University of Peking, the parliament is regarded as "one of the most stupendous events and undertakings in the religious history of the world"; valuable, among other things, in showing how strong are the great systems with which Christianity is contending, and how stupendous is the task which it has undertaken. According to Dr. Paul Carus it will "exert a lasting influence upon the religious intelligence of mankind." To the Archbishop of Zante it is "a strong foundation-stone for the religious temple of the future." The secretary of the Apostolic Durbar of Calcutta, representing the Brahmo Somaj, looks upon the parliament as the realization of what that Society of the Worshippers of God has been laboring thirty years to achieve, and as an object-lesson of that dispensation which the Brahmo Somaj is now living under, and which St. Paul speaks of as "the dispensation of the fulness of time, in which he might gather together in one all things in Christ." An old Israelite in Germany, who could not read the American papers sent him by his son, an American rabbi, but who looked with wonder at the various pictures of the men and women representing such diverse faiths in the parliament, wrote back: "The times of the Messiah have come."

According to "Le Temps," of Paris, the parliament was the most novel and amazing spectacle which America has offered. The builder of the exposition, Daniel H. Burnham, said recently that "a thousand years hence about all that the world will remember of the fair will be the parliament"; and to President Higinbotham it is "the proudest work of our exposition." The evident reason for this belief is that, while the fair was no novelty, the parliament was unique and unexampled, and purposed, in a great school of comparative theology, to bring the different faiths into contact and con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ference; to deepen the spirit of brotherhood; to emphasize the distinctive truths of each religion; to show why men believe in God and the future life; to bridge the chasm of separation between Christians of different names and religious men of all names; to induce good men to work together for common ends; and to promote the cause of international peace.

From the moment of its inception the proposed congress was attacked on various grounds; and although the great majority of the religious newspapers in America have been friendly to the undertaking, and although the parliament and its literature silenced a vast deal of criticism, still the voice of condemnation and the cries of bigotry and fear have been heard in many lands. It has been stigmatized as "Bedlam," "Babel," and "a booth in Vanity Fair;" and its promoters have been likened to Balaam and Judas Iscariot! All this shows that the parliament has important work yet to do in the world.

The hyper-orthodoxy and exclusiveness which resent the classification of Christianity with other religions should not forget the historic fact that Christianity *is* one of the faiths of the world, competing for the conquest of mankind, and that, historically considered, it has not been so faultless as to defy competition and comparison. "By their fruits ye shall know them." "I shall never forget the lesson which it has been to me," writes Prof. Max Müller, "while walking through the lowest streets of Constantinople, never to see a drunken man or woman." Reasonable men perceive that comparison must be made, and missionaries in the Orient well know that defying competition is a pretty sad business. Why should there be such an apparent lack of faith in Christian truth on the part of some zealous propagandists? Why is it felt that most people cannot be suffered to learn more than one side of this question, and why should noble-hearted disciples of Christ act on the theory that Christianity is darkness rather than light, since it seems to fear such illumination as comes from a friendly comparison with other faiths? And why should those who stab the parliament with Biblical verses omit to quote the comprehensive scriptural declaration that "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is acceptable of Him"?

Some have criticised the parliament on the ground that Christian believers must not tolerate error, by which is meant departure from the critic's own interpretations. But what are we going to do with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

error? Persecute it? If we are not willing to tolerate it, to listen to it, to find out the truth which may be at the heart of it, to supplement it, to enlighten it and remove it, we have no proper place in this humanitarian century. We should go back and take our stand by the side of Torquemada, or the persecuting Protestants of the sixteenth century.

The critics sometimes insist on the unique charms and claims of Christianity, implying that the Christian speakers in the parliament hid the heavenly light under a bushel. Dr. Morgan Dix thinks that the Christians who were present "were attacking the Cross of Christ," —a statement which is fairly questionable after reading the opinion of the missionary, Dr. George William Knox, that "the parliament was distinctively Christian in its conception, spirit, prayers, doxologies, benedictions; in its prevailing language, arguments, and faith." "Amid the bewildering maze of Oriental faiths represented," says one report, "Christianity shone out more luminous than ever as the universal, uplifting force of the world." Strong in its divine certainties and forces, Christianity received meekly the blows dealt at the sins of Christendom. The advances which the Christian faith lovingly made to the non-Christian representatives were no concession of weakness, but an illustration of its consciousness of truth and power. We do well to remember that "the representatives of Christianity" have been so unjust and so cruel in the past to the ancient Oriental religions that "no amount of courtesy or consideration would be excessive compensation."

No other event ever awakened so wide and sympathetic an interest in comparative religion, "the highest study to which the human mind can now devote its energies." The spectacle itself gave vividness and reality to the vague popular notions of the ethnic faiths. Scientific study of this theme has been confined to the few, and scholars are now grateful that the parliament has aroused such general interest in it on the part of educated people. Through the daily press of Chicago, which gave fifty columns each day for seventeen days to the proceedings of the congress, and through the religious press of many lands, the words spoken have already reached millions. The more permanent literary fruitage of this congress, giving its proceedings in books, with more or less fulness, has been large, more than a hundred thousand copies of these various volumes having already been taken. They have gone, not only into the great libraries, into the hands of preachers and scholars,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but also into the homes of thoughtful people among the laity of the six continents.[1]

Many hundreds of lectures on the parliament have been delivered in all parts of the world. Prof. G. Bonet-Maury, who ably represented liberal French Protestantism in Chicago, has frequently spoken on the parliament in France. The eloquent voice of Father Hyacinthe has been heard extolling the high purposes of this congress. Count Goblet D'Alviella has lectured on it before the School of Social Sciences annexed to the University of Brussels, and Prof. Max Müller has made it the theme of a discourse in Oxford. In his course of six addresses in Boston, Joseph Cook stoutly championed the parliament from the standpoint of aggressive orthodoxy. The parliament has been a frequent topic of discussion in colleges and Chautauqua assemblies; and at the midwinter fair in San Francisco a congress of religions was addressed by more than twenty speakers. Among the echoes of the parliament, beside the recent Liberal Congress in Chicago, are: the proposition to hold a second parliament in Benares, in regard to which Mr. Dharmapala has already consulted the Maharajah of that ancient and sacred city; and a plan, now well under way, of holding a universal religious parliament in Jerusalem at the opening of the twentieth century.

One of the first fruits of the congress of last September is the gift of $20,000 by Mrs. Caroline E. Haskell to establish a lectureship on comparative religion in the University of Chicago, where that department is already notable. This has been followed by another noble gift by Mrs. Haskell, of $100,000 to build for the university an Oriental museum, to be devoted to lecture-rooms,

[1] It is worth while to recall that the interest in this literature comes not only from the fact that the parliament dealt with all the highest themes, and was enriched by such minds as those of Cardinal Gibbons, the Archbishop of Zante, Bishop Dudley, Bishop Keane, Mgr. Seton, Mgr. D'Harlez, Canon Fremantle, Sir William Dawson, Colonel Higginson, Principal Grant, Joseph Cook, Mrs. Chant, Julia Ward Howe, Count Bernstorff, Prince Wolkonski, Miss Willard, Modi, Mozoomdar, Minas Tcheraz, Dharmapala, Rabbis Wise, Gottheil, Kohler, Silverman, Mendes, Professors Drummond, Fisher, Bruce, Carpenter, Richey, Ely, Peabody, Albert Réville, Jean Réville, Lyon, Goodspeed, Toy, Dwight, Tiele, Townsend, Wilkinson, Terry, Drs. Schaff, Byrne, Washburn, Gladden, Momerie, Briggs, Munger, Hale, Dennis, Harris, Alger, Carroll, Post, Haweis, F. E. Clark, Mills, Abbott, Scovel, Hirsch, Paton, Pentecost, Gracey, Martin, Moxom, Jessup, Rexford, Boardman, and scores beside, but also from the fact that such varied minds were agreed in the sentiments of brotherhood which called the parliament, and which made it, as the Buddhist bishop, Right Rev. Shaku Soyen, believed, "the greatest spiritual phenomenon ever produced."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

collections, and studies in the Semitic department. A proposition now comes from a prominent English scholar that a trustworthy and interesting manual of comparative religion should be prepared for the youth in our Sunday-schools. Still further, a religious parliament extension society has been organized, under the presidency of Dr. Paul Carus, to continue the work by promoting a sympathetic and mutual understanding of the world's great faiths.

In these days no study is of the highest value that is not comparative; and some Christians will yet discover that the strongest evidence of Christianity may be furnished by the study which many of them now fear, just as the comparative history of miracles is believed by many to be one of the best defences of Biblical supernaturalism. If Christianity be "the only religion which faces all the facts," it has a magnificent opportunity, both in colleges and mission fields, to vindicate itself. Its apostles need both sympathy and knowledge with regard to the faiths of the world, and the non-Christian peoples need both sympathy and knowledge in regard to Christianity. The parliament, in some measure, answered these requirements; and where it failed,—since doubtless some of the Oriental faiths were not accurately and adequately set forth,—it has furnished a stimulus to further sympathetic inquiry.

The Orientals attending the parliament were deeply impressed by the fraternity and Christian love which invited them, furnished them hospitality, gave them a free platform, and welcomed their sharpest criticisms of Christendom. The eloquent Buddhist, Mr. Hirai, said to me on leaving for Japan:

> **"I go back a Christian, by which I mean that Christianity is a religion which I shall be glad to see established in Japan. Only let the Christian missionaries not interfere with our national usages and patriotic holidays. I have been delighted with America and especially with its tolerance. I expected that before I finished my address, criticising false Christianity in Japan, I should be torn from the platform. But I was received with enthusiasm."**

Mr. Gandhi, the critic of Christian missions, said: "American Christianity I like; it is something better than what we have usually seen in India." The high priest of Shintoism, Rt. Rev. R. Shibata, and the Buddhist bishop, Zitzusen Ashitsu, write with grateful enthusiasm of their reception in America. The international friendships knit by the Congress of 1893 are a contribution to international peace, while inter-religious good-will is a manifest help to the study of comparative theology.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While modifying some popular views of the Oriental faiths, the parliament is promoting a new and humaner interest in foreign missions, by making the ethnic systems more real, and also more definite, to millions of minds, by showing Christians that these faiths are far from dead, though they may have little life-giving power over their adherents; by setting before the Christian world the magnitude of the task it has undertaken; and by teaching it that it must make its swifter and wider conquests in the future by a better understanding and a larger sympathy, rather than by contemptuous hostility and bigoted exclusiveness. The effect of the parliament was felt immediately, in the magnificent Missionary Congress which followed it, and a new tone of kindliness and tolerance has marked many of the recent gatherings and discussions in foreign missionary societies. What Christendom needs to-day is to ponder and take to heart the truths proclaimed in the Rev. Mr. Candlin's great address before the parliament, in certain practical regards the chief address made, wherein he set forth not only the need of unity, but also the method of sympathetic approach to the foreign faiths. "The glory of Christianity," said Prof. Jowett, "is not to be as unlike other religions as possible, but to be their perfection and fulfilment." As Judaism and Christianity were reconciled in the Epistle to the Hebrews, so Buddhism and Christianity, Hinduism and Christianity, Confucianism and Christianity, Islâm and Christianity, are yet to be reconciled by some supreme minds, who shall show to India, China, Japan, Arabia, that in Christ all that is good and true in these faiths has been embodied and completed by a special revelation.

No intelligent believer in Christian missions has had his faith shaken by the stories,—some of them almost fairy stories,—which two or three delegates to the parliament related. Mr. Vivekananda and Mr. Gandhi have written and spoken against Christian missions in India, and for this we should be thankful, since their criticisms have been buried by Mr. Hume and Mr. Powers under a mountain of facts. Careful inquiry into the effects of Mr. Vivekananda's addresses before our colleges has shown that, instead of discrediting missions, he has led students to investigate with renewed interest the actual religious condition of the people whom he has eulogized. Nothing but advantage will come from hearing all sides of the missionary question. No phenomenon of the century has on the whole been more remarkable than the Christian uprising in Europe and America to give the Gospel to all lands. The splendid record of missions is starred with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

achievements which no amount of criticism can dim. Let Mr. Mozoomdar and others tell Christianity how its methods can be improved. Let Mr. Candlin and Mr. Hume urge a kindlier spirit in Christian propagandism; let comparative religion become a study required of all candidates for mission fields. The result can be only good. As the "Churchman" says, "it is hard to convert a man unless it is clearly understood what he is to be converted from. Light, knowledge, sympathy are necessary to all missionary work, and surely these may come from so strange a gathering as the parliament of religions." It may be that Christianity needs to be orientalized before the more cultured intellects of the East will generally accept it.

One of the best results of the parliament has been a better understanding, among enlightened minds, between Catholics and Protestants in America. When the American Catholic archbishops, with the knowledge and consent of the Vatican, decided to take part in the parliament, they did much to give the meeting its historic importance. The faithfulness with which they carried out their part of the programme, the ability, courtesy, and kindness of their speakers, made a wholesome impression on many minds; and, although the months which have followed have been filled with acrimonious attacks on the Catholic church, there has yet been a better understanding between many Catholics and Protestants in America than ever heretofore. The fanaticism and wicked folly of the methods of the American Protective Association have not destroyed the recollections of those golden days when, for the first time in history, Protestant and Catholic divines sat together in loving fellowship. The participation of the Catholic bishops made the official refusal of the English Church to participate in the congress appear almost ridiculous. But the generous and liberal sentiments spoken by Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Redwood, Bishop Keane, and others, were the features which particularly impressed American Protestants. Count D'Alviella reports that the Catholic journals of Europe have not reproduced these sentiments, and a strong Protestant voice in Italy inquires, If the Protestant in America is justified in his overtures of peace to the Catholic, why should such overtures be refused and condemned in Italy? Is Catholicism liberty in America and intolerance in Europe? How long will this dualism of conscience continue? Words of kindness and conciliation have been spoken by Ernst Naville in the city of Calvin, but they have met no sympathetic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

response. In America, however, kindly words from Protestant pulpits are met with equal kindness by many Catholic prelates. This is a great surprise to Prof. Auguste Sabbatier, who, in the "Journal de Genève," says of the Catholic dignitaries at the parliament: "Their conduct was so novel, and so in contradiction to the habitual exclusive and uncompromising attitude of the Church of Rome, that in France it seems incredible." Castelar made a great sensation when he informed a company of literary people in his own house that leading Catholic prelates had taken part in the parliament of religions.

It required a parliament of all religions to bring together the first modern parliament of Christendom. An effort less ecumenical would not have brought together the disciples of Christ. It has often been remarked that little sectarianism was preached at the parliament. There Christendom proclaimed its Master. Inevitably this meeting which furnished the prophecy of a reunited church has had large effect on many Christian minds. Discussions of reunion have been increasingly rife. Bishop Keane says that Americans are overeager for speedy results, and he is almost content with saying that "the parliament accomplished itself." It stands as an achieved fact, sublime, impressive, perpetual, a beacon blazing with sacred and unwasting fire. But facts lead to immediate results in the world of the spirit. Feelings are changed, and then convictions. "The solemn charge which the parliament preaches to all true believers is a return to the primitive unity of Christians, as a condition precedent to the conversion of the world." With this faith in their hearts, men are active along various lines. The results may be far off, but they are certain.

It was discovered that Christianity in its main divisions is in harmony on the chief questions of doctrine and duty. The argument of Canon Fremantle, showing that faith in the great central truths of religion has been strengthened by the progress of modern thought, indicated also that these great truths throw into shadow and subordination the elaborate and technical theological creeds, and that the social movement for the common good, in which all Christians may unite, will be recognized more and more as the main part of religion. The group of papers bearing on the social problem, presented by Professors Peabody, Henderson, and Ely, and Drs. Gladden and Small, furnish the divine fire which ought to burn down the barriers of Christian separation. If we can centre the interest of Christian minds, both in the greatest themes of practical ethics and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the highest subjects of comparative theology, how divisions over pettier matters will go down! The world needs greater intellects, greater souls, greater men, and, in the divine evolution, the time appears to have come for their appearance. Attention to the supremest concerns of humanity will eliminate unholy fire from the altars at which religious zeal is ministering.

The world will not forget how the venerated Dr. Schaff declared his resolution to speak at the parliament a last word in favor of Christian unity. "He was a prophet," writes Professor Comba, from Rome, "for this word of his was his swan song." One of the chief ideas which the parliament made luminous was a reunited Christendom, the preparation for a Christianized world. Since all the religions found, as Castelar has said, "a common ground in Christianity," and since inevitably the best religion must come to the front, may we not look to see the lines of human progress centering more and more in Christ, the "unifier of humanity"? "Never before in all the earth," writes one student, "has the fact been so vividly set forth that Christianity, and it alone, is large enough to cover the whole round globe, and hold it to the heart of God." In view of the tremendous needs of modern society and the problem of the world's evangelization, Christians will certainly draw closer to each other. Of course every great movement has its reactions, and spiritual contrasts appear in close proximity. The religious world may be all borne along, like the passengers on a ship, in one direction, and yet alienations and quarrels may be intensified among the voyagers. And so in the midst of the progress now apparent we discover American Catholicism eulogizing religious liberty and brotherhood, while in American Presbyterianism appear tendencies which are "Romanizing," exclusive, and reactionary.

It was the spirit of fraternity in the heart of America which succeeded in bringing together such widely separated exponents of religion. "Enemies simply met and discovered that they were brothers who had one Father in Heaven." To speak of the deep, tender feelings awakened by the presence at the parliament of the truth-seekers of the Orient, earnest, heart-hungry, believing that they had much to teach as well as something to learn, their "faces set toward God and with some message from God;" to recall the emotions awakened during the great opening and closing hours of the parliament—would be to indulge in what many would deem a sentimental rhapsody; but it is not rhapsody to say that "the age of isolation and hatred has passed,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the age of toleration and scientific comparison has come." Kindlier feelings were certainly engendered at the parliament, and many who looked upon this meeting as a noble humanitarian measure believe that by it prejudices were removed and certain results to civilization made possible. Without concession, without any attempt to treat all religions as equally meritorious, without any compromise of any system of faith and worship, with no idea of finding or founding any new world-religion, with equal freedom gladly accorded to all races and both sexes—the sessions of the parliament continued in practically unbroken harmony. There was a vast significance to human brotherhood in the daily recital of the universal prayer, though the unity of the parliament was that of spirit rather than of creed. If this meeting simply effected a wider diffusion of brotherliness, it deserves, as the London "Daily Telegraph" has said, "a place among the notable events of our age." It was certainly a protest against exclusiveness of feeling, the ignorant pride, the ecclesiastical aloofness, and the dogmatic haughtiness which often prevail. It will be easier henceforth for men to feel "that they do not sully their religious creeds and lives by permitting them to touch any others."

The ethical unity apparent at the parliament was profoundly impressive, and whoever henceforth makes an appeal for international righteousness may quote the universal judgment and sentiment of this congress of religions. Doubtless many will fear that one effect of the parliament will be still further to modify the ancient orthodox teaching in regard to the doom of all those who have not known and accepted the historic Christ. But this result is a benign one. Many of the mistakes the critics of the parliament have made would have been avoided had they gained a larger idea of the work of Christ, as the "Original Light enlightening every man that cometh into the world"; and there should be no hesitation to receive as a part of the working creed of Christianity, the verses of Whittier:

"Wherever through the ages rise
The altars of self-sacrifice,
Where love its arms has opened wide
Or man for man has calmly died,
I see the same white wings outspread
That hovered o'er the Master's head."

Such are some of the echoes and results of this memorable meeting. The chief promoters of the parliament, grateful for what they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been able to do, would be glad to have done something better and larger. But most of them will be content if the words of Dr. Lyman Abbott shall be prophetic, "that the final issue of the religious parliament will be at once to broaden our conception of Christianity, and to make its acceptance both a logical and a spiritual necessity," or if the words of Prof. Grose, of the Chicago University, prove historic, that "the parliament was divinely designed to broaden the bounds of human brotherhood and charity; to bring the leaders of the world's religious thought to-day into bonds of sympathetic acquaintance and fellowship; to reveal spirit unto spirit; and to deepen the universal sense of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."

JOHN HENRY BARROWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PAY OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS.

THE physician is generally sure of a good living, but he must work hard to gain it. In few professions are there so many difficulties to surmount, and so many adverse circumstances to overcome, before this end can be attained. No one denies that medicine is in every sense a noble profession, but as a mere trade it takes a low rank. One of the many reasons for this is that the medical practitioner as a rule is a poor business-man, because, from the very nature of the calling, its high duties, its grave responsibilities, its noble instincts, and its laudable aims are never to be balanced by mere cash values. As soon as a medical man descends to be a mere money-getter he sacrifices that real love for his profession which lies at the root of his scientific progress. The mere fortune-hunter is necessarily the quack. But if very few medical practitioners make fortunes, there is compensation in the great satisfaction of the work itself, in the fascination of advancement, in the ambition of useful discovery, in the triumphs of mitigating suffering, in the consciousness of adding to the length of life and in thus increasing the sum of human happiness. Fortunately for the doctor, and still more so for his patrons, he is generally satisfied to practise with these aims.

The incomes of professional men can be estimated only in an approximate way. Since the amount of money earned is considered by the public as a measure of appreciation of services rendered, there is a strong tendency to give as facts what should be, rather than what actually is. Physicians form no exception to this rule. The average annual income of a physician in full practice in a large city may be stated as $2,000, and in the smaller towns and in strictly rural districts $1,200. Two or three physicians in New York make over $100,000 each year; five or six range from $50,000 to $60,000; fifty from $25,000 to $30,000; one hundred and fifty from $10,000 to $12,000; about three hundred from $5,000 to $6,000; fifteen hundred from $2,000 to $3,000; and the remainder from $800 to $1,000.

When we endeavor to estimate the average income of the doctor, we must consider many controlling influences which bear upon his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work. When he begins practice, his income is always small. The young doctor is never employed merely because he is young and anxious to earn a living. Making due allowance for the reported high appreciation of the services of the beginner, his rapid rise and phenomenal success, and his presumptuous complaint of being overworked, we can safely estimate that he does well if at the end of his first five years of business he can meet the ordinary living-expenses of a single man. The income at that time will probably range from $800 to $1,500 per annum. Many make a great deal more money than this, but, considering those that fall short of these figures, the average is reasonable. But such incomes for beginners in medicine compare very favorably with those of the professions of theology and law.

The amount to be earned depends largely upon the locality in which a physician settles and the kind of practice he follows. What is known as general family work is the most remunerative for the ordinary practitioner. In fact, this may be taken as the standard for comparison with all other forms of professional labor. Success is easier to obtain in this line. The rewards are quickly gained, but they seldom go beyond the limit of a physical possibility of making just so many visits for a standard and moderate fee. But the physician who thus makes his own place is sure of a good and steady income, is independent of transient custom, and is secure of his position so long as he pleases his patients. While the general practitioner can establish himself during the time he is obtaining business, the specialist must get his reputation before he is a success. Hence the two kinds of practice differ very widely in their gains according as they are estimated at the beginning or at the zenith of a career. With one, the fees are comparatively small, steady, and unchangeable; with the other, the reward comes later and is more substantial. But large fortunes are never made in either.

Early success depends very largely upon whether the young practitioner settles in a rural district, a growing town, or a large city. Country practice yields more the first years, but it soonest reaches its maximum. The doctor soon gets all the business obtainable, and that is the end of it. An old practitioner in a small town in Connecticut informed me that it was impossible for him, at any time during the last twenty-five years of active practice, to collect more than $3,000 annually. Yet he lived in a large house that was his own, had a well-appointed stable, raised his own garden-truck, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sent two of his sons to college. He wanted but little and was consequently rich. Many men with three times that income would hardly have done more. His metropolitan brother of equal age, rank, and capabilities, with thrice the income and a proportionately larger earning capacity, would certainly be fortunate if he owned his brown-stone domicile and kept on the right side of his debts. In fact we are often surprised to learn that even a busy and fashionable practitioner, after a long life of work, with the necessary heavy outlay for keeping his establishment in order, dies leaving his family little or nothing for their future support. Although these cases are happily exceptions to the rule, they emphasize the well-worn truism that it is what a man saves, not what he earns, that brings him comparative riches. But the physician is too much employed in saving lives to think as much of saving money as he should.

In respect to living expenses the medical man is very differently situated from his professional brother of the law or of the ministry. His office is in his residence, and this must be well appointed. The beginner is seriously handicapped in this regard. Much of his profits must go for rent and other accessory incidentals. The young practitioner—in New York, for instance—cannot secure good office accommodations in a fair or respectable neighborhood for much less than $75 of monthly rental. If he sleeps in his office and "splits the difference" between a bureau by day and a couch at night, he may obtain board for an additional sum of $8 to $10 weekly, otherwise his office is a dead loss. In other cities, such as Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis, San Francisco, Detroit, Boston, and Baltimore, the rents are much lower, ranging from $20 to $50 monthly, but the fees are proportionately smaller. In many of these localities the offices are separate from the residences, even when the doctors live in their own houses. Such arrangements, of course, materially reduce expenses of living by securing comfortable but not extravagant homes. The young minister has his rent free, while the legal beginner, with the nominal expense of desk-room, can prudently secure a hall bedroom in his boarding-house.

Payment for medical services varies in different localities. In the large cities the fees are always comparatively higher. But even in New York the charges are not extravagant. The general family practitioner charges from $2 to $5 per visit to the patient's house. The average of such fees for the wealthy is $5, although twice that sum is usually demanded by practitioners whose practice is mostly limited

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to that class. Office consultations by experts range from $10 to $25, as do also consultation visits. Visits out of town are from $10 to $20 for each hour of absence from home, plus travelling expenses, and the regular fee of $25 for the consultation itself. Not a few, however, habitually charge twice or three times these amounts and obtain them without trouble. But these men are of high reputation and unquestioned experience. Surgical operations command the highest prices, and also range according to the skill and fame of the operator, from $100 up into the thousands. Night calls are twice the amount of day calls, whether ordinary or consultation visits.

While all this is true of the established practitioner, the younger men must be content to take one dollar in their offices, and often no more for a visit to the attic of a six-story tenement-house. In many of the smaller towns the physician gets no more than half a dollar for an office visit, and but twice that for a call within a mile from his home. Yet with his small expenses he manages to live comfortably, is always busy, keeps good horses, has a little home of his own, and eventually, as in the case of our good friend from Connecticut, sends his boys to college. With him, however, the difference between a rural and a metropolitan reputation is strikingly exemplified, when within one day his city brother can see the same two-dollar patient and not infrequently be taken to the returning train with from $200 to $500 in his pocket.

Those physicians who confine their practice to a special branch make larger incomes than those who do a general practice. But when we take into account the long preparation necessary, the special studies that must be made, and the time spent in attaining proficiency and reputation, the difference in the end is not so great as might at first be supposed. To make a large income as a specialist means a reputation which is substantial and widespread. Comparatively few gain this. The young specialist who is working his way has a hard time to meet his current expenses until he can secure a firm foothold. This is especially true nowadays, when the hope of ultimately large rewards coaxes so many ambitious men to enter the already crowded ranks of specialism, often without sufficient experience and training, and eager to anticipate their rewards without waiting for the merit that makes them possible. Such men, unless they have the necessarily independent income to tide them over the depressing anxieties of deferred hope, suffer a genteel martyrdom which is the more aggravating in that it has the forced semblance of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prosperity. In the waiting and wishing for practice they hover around the free dispensaries and freer clinics, eagerly give their services to the so-called poor, and thus directly and indirectly re-act the fable of the worm that strives to flourish by consuming its own vitals.

These strugglers often submit to real privations, living a bohemian life, lodging in poor quarters, dining at cheap restaurants, subletting their offices, earning money by odd literary jobs, playing in orchestras, dabbling in art, acting as medical attendants to rich travellers, and doing such other things as may not divorce them entirely from their professional calling. With pity be it said that very many never get beyond these emergencies, and become lost in the great army of the unsuccessful and unfortunate.

The pay of the profession in different countries averages about the same when the relative cost of living is taken into account. In England the guinea fee is the standard for the office consultant, twice that amount for outside work, and a proportionate reduction for visits to the poorer classes. But in the great cities, London, Paris, Berlin, and Vienna for instance, the larger amounts go to the titled physicians and surgeons who from time immemorial have controlled the best business.

The fees in Paris for surgical operations run from $200 to $5,000. Except that the latter sum is not infrequently paid, there is no difference as compared with American or English rates. Still, there are only three or four surgeons in Paris who can command such prices, and only two who are reputed to make $100,000 a year. We have probably an equal number who could aggregate that yearly amount in New York. In Paris, $5,000 may be considered as the maximum fee for operations, such being the ruling in a recent case in which a suit was brought for $10,000 for such a surgical service. The Parisian fee for a surgeon called in consultation is $20, whether in his office or at the house of the patient. The consulting physician receives somewhat smaller pay, the amount ranging from $12 to $20 per visit, while at his office it is from $4 to $10. The highest annual income of a French physician is $40,000, although the late M. Charcot is reported to have made much more. The general practitioner in Paris averages $2 per visit, but in aristocratic circles he demands $4. Allowance must also be made for smaller living expenses in Paris than in London or New York.

In comparing our fees with those of the German physician and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

surgeon it is well to understand that, although a German mark is reckoned as equivalent to twenty-five cents, its purchasing value in Germany equals our dollar here. Thus the German family doctor, while he nominally gets but 2 marks for an office visit, can really count on $2 of actual worth to him. The specialists of Berlin and other large German cities charge from 5 to 10 marks for outside calls. The first-class medical authorities, who are necessarily professors in the universities, charge 20 marks in their offices and 30 for house visits. Taking into account the facts that competition is less active in Germany than in America; that the ratio of physicians to the population is about 1 to 1,400; that the living-rates are much lower; that even the highest medical dignitaries live, breathe, and have their offices in the upper and cheaper apartment flats, we can easily allow that the average German can have enough over ordinary profits for his beer and tobacco. All other things being equal, we can count the average earnings of the German family doctor to be about 5,000 marks, and the consultant's and professor's income 10,000 marks.

Some of the physicians of highest repute obtain enormous amounts for attendance on the nobility and the wealthier classes. Royalty often rewards them with a title besides, which gives a peculiar social stamp to their work, makes them men of acknowledged reputation, and floats them at once on the top wave of the fashionable swim.

A reputation in London means a reputation for all Great Britain and a good part of Europe besides. The Queen of England would never think of consulting any but her Court physicians, unless under a forced emergency. Some of the fees paid by royalty have been eminently befitting the giver and taker. The late physician to the Prince of Wales received for four weeks' attendance at Sandringham, during the illness of his distinguished patient from typhoid fever, not only the usual title of baronet, but a fee of £10,000. Sir Morell Mackenzie is reported to have received more than twice this amount for his treatment of the late Emperor Frederick of Germany. Dimsdale, a prominent practitioner of London in 1762, was called thence to St. Petersburg to inoculate the Empress Catherine II., for which he received not only the equivalent of $50,000, but an extra $10,000 for travelling expenses, the title of baron, and a life pension of $2,500 yearly. His Royal Highness the Nawab of Rampur, India, recently paid an English army surgeon £50,000 for a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

three-months occasional attendance in an ordinary attack of rheumatism. This is said to be the largest fee ever paid for medical services in that so-called heathen country. Verily even the benighted races can afford us profitable object-lessons for imitation! The late Sir Andrew Clark, Gladstone's physician, often charged $1,000 for running down from London to Liverpool, and the late Sir William Gull commanded equally high rates for similar services. Although this fee appears to be a princely one, with men whose earning capacity was as large as was theirs, the inconveniences attendant on a sudden journey are very great, and the loss sustained by the interruption of the routine of many days of subsequent business scarcely covered the abstract profit. A Russian surgeon charged a wealthy notable of Odessa $6,000 for opening an abscess of the hip, the time occupied being about ten minutes. And better still, while on the same visit, he took a chance shot at another patient in the shape of a similarly simple operation, for which he received nearly $1,500 more, certainly enough extra to pay the fee of the railway porter on his homeward journey.

But in all this it is not so much the doing as the knowing how to do. When the French peasant said that there were not ten francs' worth of paint on Rosa Bonheur's "Horse Fair," he was incapable of valuing high art. "Five dollars for amputating the leg," said the surgeon, "and nine hundred and ninety-five for knowing how," —and the victim was thankful accordingly.

In giving testimony to the value of professional time, in a recent suit in London, a leading surgeon maintained that $150 was a fair charge for a day's absence; that $2,000 should be paid for a trip from London to Paris, and $150 or $200 per day extra while there. Contrast these fees with those paid the late physicians who watched so faithfully over our lamented Garfield. For three months' services of the entire staff, but $25,000 was paid, and then only after an amount of abuse, by buncombe Congressmen, for alleged unskilled treatment—and almost murder—on the part of the surgeons, which was a disgrace to the nation. Much has been said of the expensive physicians in attendance upon General Grant, but the whole amount paid did not exceed $18,000. Of this Dr. Douglas received $12,000, two-thirds of the entire sum, as he was the only one who gave up his business and tendered his undivided attention for five months to the service of the patient. As General Grant was virtually a poor man at the time, only the most reasonable and ordinary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fees were charged by the other members of the staff, which it is proper to say were promptly and thankfully paid by the family.

American millionaires are as a rule quite liberal with their physicians, but the attendant who has only one patient must necessarily have something for the sacrifice of his other business. The sums range from $60,000 to $100,000 yearly, with the usual luxurious surroundings. One physician received $87,000 for attending the daughter of a millionaire for two months; another, $60,000 for a yachting cruise of less than six months; and another $2,000 for intubation—an operation performed in a few seconds. A distinguished ear specialist was paid $5,000 for a flying trip from New York to St. Paul, and still another physician received $25,000 for a similar professional visit involving a trip from Philadelphia to San Francisco. When we add to these the gifts from grateful patients, ranging from an inkstand to a house, the widest possibilities are offered for the discharge of the most elastic obligations that exist between giver and taker. There are, however, many exceptions to these rules, which are notable as proving that wealth and generosity are not always synonymous terms. A distinguished physician, not long ago, sued for $2,500 for ten days' service in a Southern town in a case of typhoid fever, but the jury allowed barely $1,500.

When we compare the high fees in medicine with those received for legal services, it is difficult to make a reasonable comparison. It must be conceded that the ordinary doctor makes a surer and better income than the ordinary lawyer, but when the high fees are reached the shoe is surely on the other foot. In law, however, the less you do the more you get. There is, in fact, an inverse ratio of fees to services which is startlingly apparent. Talk of $50,000, $60,000, and $100,000 in single fees in a lifetime!—such amounts are often multiplied many times over in the practice of leading lawyers. No usual pay for a skilful and dangerous operation brings $25,000 or $30,000 to the lucky surgeon; yet such sums are not uncommonly paid for legal services in the defence of wealthy criminals. The slayer of Jim Fisk paid to his lawyer $200,000,—a good year's work for a professional man. The late Hall McAllister received a fee of $20,000 on a compromised case and did not even appear in court. No more time was occupied than in amputating a leg for which probably $1,000 would be charged by a surgeon of equal eminence and skill. The late John B. Felton received from James Lick $50,000 for setting aside his first deed of trust, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work of a few hours. A young and inexperienced attorney asked $5,000 for a breach-of-promise case that did not last a week. In the settlement of estates, in the drawing of articles of incorporation for large and wealthy syndicates, the lawyer's fees often reach $100,000. A notable illustration was afforded in the recent reorganization of the Sugar Trust, which gave its attorney a little fortune for a week's work. The legal fee in the Lux estate exceeded $250,000, and yet we can hardly conclude that services to the estate of a rich man are worth so much more than those for saving his life. In fact we are forced to assume that such services are paid for out of all proportion to their real value.

But these large rewards carry with them their own penalty. The leading element of mere money-making has infused into legal practice a purely commercial aspect which saps its real professional character. Companies are now forming to monopolize these extravagantly large gains and divide them among hundreds of members or stockholders in their concerns. Thus we have title-guarantee and trust companies, lawyers' title and insurance companies, through which legal advice is doled out by the yard and sold by measure. Thus, every evil has its remedy. The pendulum swings too far, and then the spring snaps. Happily there is no such tendency in medicine. One reason for this is that the service of the doctor is of a more personal character than that of any other professional man. There can be thus no machine work liable to be monopolized by a capitalized syndicate. The quacks can make pills by the wholesale, it is true, but they never can fit them to the individual case. There are no automatic machines for amputating limbs, auscultating chests, or diagnosticating diseases. The doctor has a monopoly of his name and his methods, his skill and his judgment, which no power can gainsay, and thus his personal fee is guaranteed against infringement by outside influence. This is his comfort and his right.

Comparing his pay with that of the minister, he has the advantage of being in business for himself, and is, in a great measure, independent of individual patrons. He can be progressive up to the limit of the highest possibilities and increase his income proportionately. The minister, as a rule, goes through a lifetime of hard work subject to the whims of fault-finding members of his flock, liable to dismissal if he puts the hay too high for the little horses, gets what content and support he can from a small fixed salary here, and must offset it merely with the hope of a better life hereafter.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So, all told, the doctor is not so badly off if he can get what is really due him. But every one knows that he loses a great deal in bad debts. He is generally the last to be paid, but, strange to say, is the first to be called when there is real trouble in the family.

> "Three faces wears the doctor: When first sought,
> An Angel's,—and a God's, the cure half wrought:
> But when, that cure complete, he seeks his fee,
> The Devil looks less terrible than he."

The peculiar and personal services of the physician have much to do in explaining this lax system of payment. A main difficulty lies, in most cases, in the separation of the purely philanthropic element from the strictly practical one. He is called more as a friendly helper in time of dire emergency than as a mere tradesman. He cannot demand a retainer before he assuages the pain of an infant's colic. He has no time, in case of hæmorrhage, to mention his fee; consequently his work is mostly done on credit, especially as he is the last man who is expected, after saving a life, and amid the profusion of heartfelt thanks, to discuss the purely material element in the equation. But it does not take him long to discover that he cannot live on sentiment alone. He soon learns that he must do business on business principles. His patients must be taught to pay promptly. Nowhere but in England and in France is this system perfectly enforced, and yet no complaints are made. No patient would think of consulting an English or Parisian physician without leaving his fee upon the table. Happily for both parties in the contract this practice is becoming fashionable with the leading consultants in all the large cities of this country. Where pecuniary credit must, from the circumstances of the case, be imperative, there is no reason why the doctor should not in the end get all that is due him. Although the value of his services can never virtually be fixed by his patrons, he should nevertheless fix them for himself. This gives them a strictly business aspect. If the charges are always just and reasonable, no deductions are necessary. In cases of disaster, misfortune, accident, or sickness, the consequent loss of money affects only one side in every other business, and why should there be any exception in the case of medical services when rendered to a man sick and out of work? Even the actual death of the patient is a gain to the undertaker, who is always paid on the spot, and whose profits almost equal those of the plumber, the policeman, or the political boss. It may be pertinent in this connection to mention in passing that sometimes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the doctor forestalls the fees of the grim and unwelcome man of crape. A curiously unique instance of this occurred to the writer, in which two children of a family were happily saved from death by a timely operation. The father, although a poor man, viewed the situation so philosophically that the probable expenses of the funeral were calculated and presented to the doctor as his fee, with the extra satisfaction to the parent of having the two children thrown into the bargain. This certainly was a clear gain all around.

Aside from the want of business tact on the part of the medical attendant, there are many other considerations which bear upon the amount of fees collected. The law of demand and supply affects medical services as well as other salable commodities. When the profession is so overcrowded in this country that there is only one physician to five hundred inhabitants, when the incomes are averaged, the individual recipients can scarcely expect to be millionaires.

Then comes the hospital and dispensary abuse. This takes thousands of dollars from the physician which rightfully belong to him. He is always ready to help the really poor, to give his services gratuitously to hospital, dispensary, and clinic, but naturally objects to imposition by those who can, but will not, pay for treatment. This abuse of medical charity is so notorious that it is considered to be the principal if not the only reason why competent young medical men cannot get a fair start and make an ordinary living in our large cities. In New York, for instance, the clinics and dispensaries wrongfully absorb almost all the available business of the young practitioner. It is not an uncommon thing to see women dressed in sealskin sacques and decked with diamonds boldly claiming the free treatment intended only for the deserving poor. Many of these come in cabs, and importunately demand prompt attention, while the poor doctor who gives them free advice comes and goes on a five-cent car-fare. But this grave abuse is winked at by the leading institutions, and complaints avail nothing. The fact is, there are in the larger cities more hospitals and dispensaries than are necessary. In New York this is unquestionably true. One-half the number would respond to all the charity work that is really needed. The medical profession does more than its share of philanthropic work in these institutions. There is not a surgeon in attendance on any of the larger hospitals who does not perform operations which would aggregate in money value from $50,000 to $100,000 yearly. The only material return is an increased experience and dexterity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which he can use in such outside work as the hospitals permit him to do.

Another serious obstacle to legitimate income is the quack-medicine trade. Quackery is medical practice commercialized, and therefore prostituted. It thrives because the victims are in the majority and are easily reached by lying advertisements. "What is the proportion of sensible people in this crowd?" asked a patent-medicine man of a physician. "About one in ten," was the answer. "I take the nine and leave the one to you," said the quack. This represents the majority which help to make the quack rich. The nostrums cost almost nothing; but the capital is used in advertising; in publishing portraits of the idiots and feeble-minded who imagine themselves cured; in placarding fences; in defacing scenery; in circulating manufactured certificates; in ridiculing scientific medicine; in alarming the credulous; in claiming false discoveries; and in vaunting impossible results. But these are the men who make the money. Medicine to them is the nickel-in-the-slot machine. The diagnosis is ready-made to suit every need, and even otherwise sensible people are being educated into quackery, and into the belief that every man can be his own doctor and not have a fool for a patient.

To sum up these conclusions, we must admit that medicine pays in its own good way. The mere fee is its smallest recompense. The ancients believed that the man who healed his fellows was next to the gods.

GEORGE F. SHRADY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MACAULAY'S PLACE IN LITERATURE.[1]

MACAULAY, who counted his years of life by those of this century, may fairly claim to have had the greatest body of readers and to be the most admired prose-writer of the Victorian age. It is now nearly seventy years since his first brilliant essay on "Milton" took the world by storm. It is exactly half a century since that fascinating series of "Essays" was closed, and little short of that time since his famous "History" appeared. The editions of it in England and in America are counted by thousands; it has six translations into German, and translations into ten other European languages. It made him rich, famous, and a peer. Has it given him a foremost place in English literature?

Here is a case where the judgment of the public and the judgment of experts is in striking contrast. The readers both of the Old and of the New World continue to give the most practical evidence that they love his books. Macaulay is a rare example of a writer all of whose works are almost equally popular and believed by many to be equally good. "Essays," "Lays," "History," "Lives"—all are read by millions: as critic, poet, historian, biographer, Macaulay has achieved world-wide renown. And yet some of our best critics deny him either fine taste, or subtlety, or delicate discrimination, catholic sympathies, or serene judgment. They say he is always more declaimer than thinker—more advocate than judge. The poets deny that the "Lays" are poetry at all. The modern school of scientific historians declare that the "History" is a splendid failure, and it proves how rotten was the theory on which it is constructed. The purists in style shake their heads over his everlasting antitheses, the mannerism of violent phrases and the perpetual abuse of paradox. His most indulgent friends admit the force of these defects, which they usually speak of as his "limitations" or his "methods." Here, indeed, is an opportunity for one of those long-drawn antitheses of which Macaulay was so great a master. How he would himself have revelled in the paradox—"that books which were household words

[1] Copyright also in England.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with every cow-boy in Nevada and every Baboo in Bengal were condemned by men of culture as the work of a Philistine and a mannerist"; "how ballads which were the delight of every school-boy were ridiculed by critics as rhetorical jingles that would hardly win a prize in a public school"; "how the most famous of all modern reviewers scarcely gave us one example of delicate appreciation or subtle analysis"; how it comes about "that the most elaborate of modern histories does not contain an idea above the commonplaces of a crammer's text-book"—and so forth, in the true Black-and-White style which is so clear and so familiar. But let us beware of applying to Macaulay himself that tone of exaggeration and laborious antithesis which he so often applied to others. Boswell, he says, was immortal, "*because* he was a dunce, a parasite, and a coxcomb." It would be a feeble parody to retort that Macaulay became a great literary power "*because* he had no philosophy, little subtlety, and a coarse taste." For my part, I am slow to believe that the judgment of the whole English-speaking race, a judgment maintained over more than half a century, can be altogether wrong; and the writer who has given such delight, has influenced so many writers, and has taught so much to so many persons, can hardly have been a shallow mannerist or an ungovernable partisan. No one denies that Macaulay had a prodigious knowledge of books; that in literary fecundity and in varied improvisation he has never been surpassed; that his good sense is unfailing, his spirit manly, just, and generous; and lastly that his command over language had unequalled qualities of precision, energy, and brilliance. These are all very great and sterling qualities. And it is right to acknowledge them with no unstinted honour—even whilst we are fully conscious of the profound shortcomings and limitations that accompanied but did not destroy them.

In a previous paper we discussed the permanent contribution to English literature of Thomas Carlyle; and it is curious to note how complete a contrast these two famous writers present. Carlyle was a simple, self-taught, recluse man of letters: Macaulay was legislator, cabinet minister, orator, politician, peer—a pet of society, a famous talker, and member of numerous academies. Carlyle was poor, despondent, morbid, and cynical: Macaulay was rich, optimist, overflowing with health, high spirits, and good nature. The one hardly ever knew what the world called success: the other hardly ever knew failure. Carlyle had in him the elements that make the poet, the prophet, the apostle, the social philosopher. In Macaulay

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these were singularly wanting; he was the man of affairs, the busy politician, the rhetorician, the eulogist of society as it is, the believer in material progress, in the ultimate triumph of all that is practical and commonplace, and in the final discomfiture of all that is visionary and utopian. The Teufelsdröckhian dialect is obscure even to its select students: the Macaulay sentence is plain as that of Swift himself. Carlyle's gospel is full of passion, novelty, suggestion, theory, and social problems. Macaulay turned his back on social problems and disdained any kind of gospel. He had no mission to tell the world how bad it is: on the contrary, he was never wearied with his proofs that it ought to be well satisfied with its lot and its vast superiority in all things to its ancestors.

The great public, wherever English books penetrate, from the White Sea to Australia, from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean, loves the brilliant, manly, downright optimist; the critics and the philosophers care more for the moody and prophetic pessimist. But this does not decide the matter; and it does not follow that either public or critic has the whole truth. If books were written only in the dialect and with the apocalyptic spirit of "Sartor," it is certain that millions would cease to read books, and could gain little from books if they did. And if the only books were such "purple patches" of history as Macaulay left us, with their hard and fast divisions of men into sheep and goats, and minute biographies of fops, pedants, and grandees, narrated in the same resonant, rhetorical, unsympathetic, and falsely emphatic style—this generation would have a very patchwork idea of past ages and a narrow sense of the resources of our English language. There is room for both literary schools, and we need teachers of many kinds. We must not ask of any kind more than they can give. Macaulay has led millions who read no one else, or who never read before, to know something of the past, and to enjoy reading. He will have done them serious harm, if he has persuaded them that this is the best that can be done in historical literature, or that this is the way in which the English language can be most fitly used. Let us be thankful for his energy, learning, brilliance. He is no priest, philosopher, or master. Let us delight in him as a fireside companion. In one thing all agree—critics and public, friends and opponents. Macaulay's was a life of purity, honour, courage, generosity, affection, and manly perseverance, almost without a stain or a defect. His life, it was true, was singularly fortunate, and he had but few trials and no formidable obstacles.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He was bred up in the comfortable egotism of the opulent middle classes; the religion of comfort, *laisser-faire*, and social order was infused into his bones. But, so far as his traditions and temper would suffer, his life was as honourable, as unsullied, and as generous, as ever was that of any man who lived in the fierce light that beats upon the famous. We know his nature and his career as well as we know any man's; and we find it on every side wholesome, just, and right. He has been fortunate in his biographers, and amply criticised by the best judges. His nephew, Sir George Trevelyan, has written his life at length in a fine book. Dean Milman and Mark Pattison have given us vignettes; Cotter Morison has adorned the "Men of Letters" series with a delightful and sympathetic sketch; and John Morley and Leslie Stephen have weighed his work in the balance with judicial acumen and temperate firmness. There is but one voice in all this company. It was a fine, generous, honourable, and sterling nature. His books deserve their vast popularity and may long continue to maintain it. But Macaulay must not be judged amongst philosophers—nor even amongst the real masters of the English language. And, unless duly corrected, he may lead historical students astray and his imitators into an obtrusive mannerism.

Let us take a famous passage from one of his most famous essays, written in the zenith of his powers after his return from India, at the age of forty—an essay on a grand subject which never ceased to fascinate his imagination, composed with all his amazing resources of memory and his dazzling mastery of colour. It is the third paragraph of his well-known review of Von Ranke's "History of the Popes." The passage is familiar to all readers, and some of its phrases are household words; it is rather long as well as trite. But it contains in a single page such a profusion of historical suggestion; it is so vigorous, so characteristic of Macaulay in all his undoubted resources as in all his mannerism and limitations; it is so essentially true, and yet so thoroughly obvious; it is so grand in form, and yet so meagre in philosophic logic, that it may be worth while to analyze it in detail; and for that purpose it must be set forth, even though it convey to most readers little more than a sonorous truism.

"There is not, and there never was on this earth, a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church. The history of that Church joins together the two great ages of human civilization. No other institution is left standing which carries the mind back to the times when the smoke of sacrifice rose from the Pantheon, and when camelopards and tigers bounded in the Flavian amphitheatre. The proudest royal houses are but of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yesterday, when compared with the line of the Supreme Pontiffs. That line we trace back in unbroken series, from the Pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth century to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth; and far beyond Pepin the august dynasty extends, till it is lost in the twilight of fable. The republic of Venice came next in antiquity. But the republic of Venice was modern when compared with the Papacy; and the republic of Venice is gone, and the Papacy remains. The Papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigour. The Catholic Church is still sending forth to the furthest ends of the world, missionaries as zealous as those who landed in Kent with Augustin, and still confronting hostile kings with the same spirit with which she confronted Attila. The number of her children is greater than in any former age. Her acquisitions in the New World have more than compensated her for what she has lost in the Old. Her spiritual ascendancy extends over the vast countries which lie between the plains of the Missouri and Cape Horn, countries which, a century hence, may not improbably contain a population as large as that which now inhabits Europe. The members of her communion are certainly not fewer than a hundred and fifty millions; and it will be difficult to show that all the other Christian sects united amount to a hundred and twenty millions. Nor do we see any sign which indicates that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had crossed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

Here we have Macaulay in all his strength and all his limitations. The passage contains in the main a solid truth—a truth which was very little accepted in England in the year 1840—a truth of vast import and very needful to assert. And this truth is clothed in such pomp of illustration and is hammered into the mind with such accumulated blows; it is so clear, so hard, so coruscating with images, that it is impossible to escape its effect. The paragraph is one never to be forgotten, and not easy to be refuted or qualified. No intelligent tiro in history can read that page without being set a-thinking, without feeling that he has a formidable problem to solve. Tens of thousands of young minds must have had that deeply coloured picture of Rome visibly before them in many a Protestant home in England and in America. Now, all this is a very great merit. To have posed a great historical problem, at a time when it was very faintly grasped, and to have sent it ringing across the English-speaking world in such a form that he who runs may read—nay he who rides, he who sails, he who watches sheep or stock *must* read—this is a real and signal service conferred on literature and on thought. Compare

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this solid sense with Carlyle's ribaldry about "the three-hatted Papa," "pig's wash," "servants of the Devil," "this accursed nightmare," and the rest of his execrations—and we see the difference between the sane judgment of the man of the world and the prejudices of intolerant fanaticism.

But, unfortunately, Macaulay, having stated in majestic antitheses his problem of "the unchangeable Church," makes no attempt to provide us with a solution. This splendid eulogium is not meant to convert us to Catholicism—very far from it. Macaulay was no Catholic, and had only a sort of literary admiration for the Papacy. As Mr. Cotter Morison has shown, he leaves the problem just where he found it, and such theories as he offers are not quite trustworthy. He does not suggest that the Catholic Church is permanent because it possesses truth: but, rather, because men's ideas of truth are a matter of idiosyncrasy or digestion. The whole essay is not a very safe guide to the history of Protestantism or of Catholicism, though it is full of brilliant points and sensible assertions. And in the end our essayist, the rebel from his Puritan traditions, and the close ally of sceptical Gallios, after forty pages of learned *pros* and *cons*, declares that he will not say more for fear of "exciting angry feelings." He rather sneers at Protestant fervour: he declaims grand sentences about Catholic fervour. He will not declare for either of them; and it does not seem to matter much in the long run for which men declare, provided they can be kept well in hand by saving common sense. In the mean time the topic is a mine of paradox to the picturesque historian. This is not philosophy, it is not history, but it is full of a certain rich literary seed.

The passage, though a truism to all thoughtful men, was a striking novelty to English Protestants fifty years ago. But it will hardly bear a close scrutiny of these sweeping, sharp-edged, "cock-sure" dogmas of which it is composed. The exact propositions it contains may be singly accurate; but as to the most enduring "work of human policy," it is fair to remember that the Civil Law of Rome has a continuous history of at least twenty-four centuries; that the Roman Empire from Augustus to the last Constantine endured for fifteen centuries; and from Augustus to the last Hapsburg it endured for eighteen centuries. There is a certain ambiguity between the way in which Macaulay alternates between the Papacy and the Christian Church, which are not at all the same thing. The Papacy, as a European or cosmical institution, can hardly be said to have more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than twelve centuries of continuous history on the stage of the world. The religion and institutions of Confucius and of Buddha have twice that epoch; and the religion and institutions of Moses have thirty centuries; and the Califate in some form or other is nearly coeval with the Papacy. The judicious eulogist has guarded himself against denying in words any of these facts; but a cool survey of universal history will somewhat blunt the edge of Macaulay's trenchant phrases. After all, we must admit that the passage as a whole, apart from the superlatives, is substantially true, and contains a most valuable and very striking thought. With what a wealth of illustration is it enforced, with what telling contrasts, with what gorgeous associations! How vivid the images, how stately the personages, who are called up to heighten the lights of this tableau of the Vatican! Ancient and modern civilization are joined by it; it recalls the Pantheon and the Colosseum; it gave sanction to the Empire of Charlemagne and to that of Napoleon, it inspired Augustin, and confronted Attila; Venice is a mere modern foundation; the Church is older than Hengist and Horsa, Clovis, or Mahomet; yet it stretches over the Atlantic continent from Missouri to Cape Horn, and still goes on conquering and to conquer. And the climax of this kaleidoscopic "symphony in purple and gold"—the New Zealander sketching the ruins of St. Paul's from a broken arch of London Bridge—has become a proverb, and is repeated daily by men who never heard of Macaulay, much less of Von Ranke, and is an inimitable bit of picturesque colouring. It is very telling, nobly hyperbolic, no man can misunderstand it, or forget it. The most practised hand will not find it easy to "go one better than" Macaulay in a swingeing trope. It is a fascinating literary artifice, and it has fascinated many to their ruin. In feebler hands, it degenerates into what in London journalistic slang is known as "telegraphese." A pocket encyclopedia and a copious store of adjectives have enabled many a youth to roar out brilliant articles "as gently as a sucking dove." But all men of power have their imitators, and are open to parody and spurious coining. Now, Macaulay, however brilliant and kaleidoscopic, is always using his own vast reading, his own warm imagination, his unfailing fecundity, and his sterling good sense.

Turn to the style of the passage—it is perfectly pellucid in meaning, rings on the ear like the crack of a rifle, is sonorous, rich, and swift. One can fancy the whole passage spoken by an orator: indeed it is difficult to resist the illusion that it was "declaimed" before

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it was written. We catch the oratorical tags and devices, the repeated phrase, the incessant antithesis, the alternate rise and fall of eloquent speech. It is declamation—fine declamation—but we miss the musical undertones, the subtle involutions, the unexpected bursts, and mysterious cadences of really great written prose. The term "the Republic of Venice" is repeated three times in three lines: the term "the Papacy" is repeated three times in two lines. Any other writer would substitute a simple "it" for most of these; and it is difficult to see how the paragraph would lose. The orator aids his hearers by constant repetition of the same term: the writer avoids this lest he prove monotonous. The short sentences of four or five words interposed to break the torrent—the repetition of the same words—the see-saw of black and white, old and young, base and pure—all these are the stock in trade of the rhetorician, not of the master of written prose. Now, Macaulay was a rhetorician, a consummate rhetorician, who wrote powerful invectives or panegyrics in massive rhetoric which differed from speeches mainly in their very close fibre, in their chiselled phrasing, and above all in their dazzling profusion of literary illustration. If it was oratory, it was the oratory of a speaker of enormous reading, inexhaustible memory, and consummate skill with words.

There is nothing at all exceptional about this passage that has been chosen for analysis. It is a fair and typical piece of Macaulay's best style. Indeed his method is so uniform and so regular that any page of his writing exhibits the same force and the same defects as any other. Take one of the most famous of his scenes, the trial of Warren Hastings, toward the end of that elaborate essay, written in 1841. Every one knows the gorgeous and sonorous description of Westminster Hall, beginning—"The place was worthy of such a trial." In the next sentence the word "hall" recurs five times, and the word "which" three times, and is not related to the same noun. Ten sentences in succession open with the word "there." It is a perfect galaxy of varied colour, pomp, and illustration: but the effect is somewhat artificial, and the whole scene smells of the court upholsterer. The "just sentence of Bacon" pairs off with "the just absolution of Somers"; the "greatest painter" sits beside the "greatest scholar of the age"; ladies have "lips more persuasive than those of Fox"; there too is "the beautiful mother of a beautiful race." And in the midst of these long-drawn superlatives and glittering contrasts come in short martial phrases, as brief and sharp as a drill-ser-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jeant's word of command. "Neither military nor civil pomp was wanting"—"The avenues were lined with grenadiers"—"The streets were kept clear by cavalry." No man can forget these short, hard, decisive sentences.

The artificial structure of his paragraphs grew upon Macaulay with age. His "History of England" opens with a paragraph of four sentences. Each of these begins with "I purpose," "I shall"; and the last sentence of the four has ten clauses each beginning with "how." The next paragraph has four successive sentences beginning "It will be seen"—and the last sentence has again three clauses each beginning with "how." The fourth paragraph contains the word, "I," four times in as many lines. This method of composition has its own merits. The repetition of words and phrases helps the perception and prevents the possibility of misunderstanding. Where effects are simply enumerated, the monotony of form is logically correct. Every successive sentence heralded by a repeated "how," or "there," or "I," adjusts itself into its proper line without an effort of thought on the reader's part. It is not graceful; it is pompous, and distinctly rhetorical. But it is eminently clear, emphatic, orderly, and easy to follow or to remember. Hence it is unpleasing to the finely attuned ear, and is counted somewhat vulgar by the trained lover of style, whilst it is immensely popular with those who read but little, and is able to give them as much pleasure as it gives instruction.

The famous passage about Westminster Hall, written in 1841, may be compared with the equally known passage on the Chapel in the Tower which occurs in the fifth chapter of the "History," written in 1848. It begins as all lovers of English remember—"In truth there is no sadder spot on the earth than that little cemetery." The passage continues with "there" or "thither" repeated eight times; it bristles with contrasts, graces and horrors, antithesis, climax, and sonorous heraldries. "Such was the dust with which the dust of Monmouth mingled." It is a fine paragraph, which has impressed and delighted millions. But it is, after all, rather facile moralizing; its rhetorical artifice has been imitated with success in many a prize essay and not a few tall-talking journals. How much more pathos is there in a stanza from Gray's "Elegy," or a sentence from Carlyle's "Bastille," or Burke's "French Revolution"!

The habit of false emphasis and the love of superlatives is a far worse defect, and no one has attempted to clear Macaulay of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charge. It runs through every page he wrote, from his essay on Milton to the Death of James II., who valued Lord Perth as "author of the last improvements on the thumb-screw." Indeed no more glaring example of Macaulay's *megalomania* or taste for exaggeration can be found than the famous piece in the "Milton" on the Restoration of Charles II.

"Then came those days, never to be recalled without a blush, the days of servitude without loyalty and sensuality without love, of dwarfish talents and gigantic vices, the paradise of cold hearts and narrow minds, the golden age of the coward, the bigot, and the slave. The king cringed to his rival that he might trample on his people, sank into a viceroy of France, and pocketed, with complacent infamy, her degrading insults, and her more degrading gold. The caresses of harlots and the jests of buffoons regulated the policy of the State. The government had just ability enough to deceive and just religion enough to persecute. The principles of liberty were the scoff of every grinning courtier, and the Anathema Maranatha of every fawning dean. In every high place, worship was paid to Charles and James, Belial and Moloch; and England propitiated these obscene and cruel idols with the blood of her best and bravest children. Crime succeeded to crime, and disgrace to disgrace, till the race, accursed of God and man, was a second time driven forth, to wander on the face of the earth, and to be a by-word and a shaking of the head to the nations."

This is vigorous invective, of the style of Cicero against Catiline, or Junius attacking a duke; it is brilliant rhetoric and scathing satire. At bottom it has substantial truth, if the attention is fixed on Whitehall and the scandalous chronicle of its frequenters. It differs also from much in Macaulay's invectives in being the genuine hot-headed passion of an ardent reformer only twenty-five years old. It is substantially true as a picture of the Court at the Restoration: but in form how extravagant, even of that! Charles II. is Belial: James is Moloch; and Charles is *propitiated* by the blood of Englishmen!—Charles, easy, courteous, good-natured, profligate Charles. And all this of the age of the "Paradise Lost" and the "Morning Hymn," of Jeremy Taylor, Izaak Walton, Locke, Newton, and Wren! Watch Macaulay banging on his antithetic drum—"servitude without loyalty and sensuality without love"—"dwarfish talents and gigantic vices"—"ability enough to deceive"—"religion enough to persecute." Every phrase is a superlative; every word has its contrast; every sentence has its climax. And withal let us admit that it is tremendously powerful, that no one who ever read it can forget it, and few even who have read it fail to be tinged with its fury and contempt. And, though a tissue of superlatives, it bears a solid truth, and has turned to just thoughts many a young spirit that was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fascinated by Charles's good-nature and impressed with the halo of the divine claims of kings.

But the savage sarcasms which are tolerable in a passionate young reformer smarting under the follies of George IV., are a serious defect when used indiscriminately of men and women in every age and under every condition. In his "Machiavelli," Macaulay hints that the best histories are perhaps "those in which a little of fictitious narrative is judiciously employed." "Much," he says, "is gained in effect." It is to be feared that this youthful indiscretion was never wholly purged out of him. Boswell, we know, was "a dunce, a parasite, and a coxcomb"—*and therefore* immortal. He was one of "the smallest men that ever lived," of "the meanest and feeblest intellect," "servile," "shallow," "a bigot and a sot," and so forth—and yet "a great writer, *because* he was a great fool." We all know what is meant; and there is a substratum of truth in this; but it is tearing a paradox to tatters. How different has Carlyle dealt with poor dear Bozzy! Croker's "Boswell's Johnson" "is as bad as bad can be," full of "monstrous blunders"—(he had put 1761 for 1766) "gross mistakes"—"for which a school-boy would be flogged." Southey is "utterly destitute of the power of discerning truth from falsehood." He prints a joke which "is enough to make us ashamed of our species." Robert Montgomery pours out "a roaring cataract of nonsense." One of his tropes is "the worst similitude in the world." And yet Macaulay can rebuke Johnson for "big words wasted on little things"!

Neither Cicero, Milton, Swift, nor Junius ever dealt in more furious words than Macaulay, who had not the excuse of controversy or passion. Frederick William of Prussia was "the most execrable of fiends, a cross between Moloch and Puck"; "his palace was hell"; compared with the Prince, afterwards Frederick the Great, "Oliver Twist in the workhouse, and Smike at Dotheboys Hall were petted children." It would be difficult for Mark Twain to beat that. "The follies and vices of King John *were the salvation* of England." Cranmer was peculiarly fitted to organise the Church of England by being "unscrupulous, indifferent, a coward and a time-server." James I. was given to "stammering, slobbering, shedding unmanly tears," "alternating between the buffoon and the pedagogue." James II. "amused himself with hearing Covenanters shriek"; he was "a libertine, singularly slow and narrow in understanding, obstinate, harsh, and unforgiving." The country gentleman of that age talked

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

like "the most ignorant clown"; his wife and daughter were in taste "below a stillroom maid of the present day." The chaplain was a mere servant, and was expected to marry a servant girl whose character had been blown upon.

But it ought to be remembered that all of these descriptions are substantially true. Macaulay's pictures of the Stuarts, of Cromwell, of the Restoration and its courtiers, of Milton, of William III., are all faithful and just; Boswell *was* often absurd, Southey *was* shallow, Montgomery *was* an impostor; Frederick William *did* treat his son brutally; the country squire and the parson two centuries ago *were* much rougher people than they are to-day. And if Macaulay had simply told us this in measured language of this kind, he would have failed in beating his lesson into the mind. Not only was "a little of fictitious narrative judiciously employed," but not a little of picturesque exaggeration and redundant superlatives. Carlyle is an even worse offender in this line. Did he not call Macaulay himself "squat, low-browed, commonplace"—"a poor creature, with his dictionary literature and his saloon arrogance"—"no vision in him"—"will neither see nor do any great thing"?[1] Ruskin, Freeman, Froude, and others have been tempted to deal in gross superlatives. But with all these it has been under the stimulus of violent indignation. With Macaulay the superlatives pour out as his native vernacular without heat or wrath, as a mere rhetorician's trick, as the favourite tones of a great colourist. And though the trick, like all literary tricks, grows upon the artist, and becomes singularly offensive to the man of taste, it must always be remembered that, with Macaulay, the praise or blame is usually just and true; he is very rarely unfair and wrong, as Carlyle so often is; and if Macaulay resorts too often to the superlative degree, he is usually entitled to use the comparative degree of the same adjective.

The style, with all its defects, has had a solid success and has done great things. By clothing his historical judgments and his critical reflections in these cutting and sonorous periods, he has forced them on the attention of a vast body of readers wherever English is read at all, and on millions who have neither time nor attainments for any regular studies of their own. How many men has Macaulay succeeded in reaching, to whom all other history and criticism is a closed book, or a book in an unknown tongue! If he were a sciolist or a wrong-headed fanatic, this would be a serious evil. But, as he

[1] Froude's "Carlyle," I. 192.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is substantially right in his judgments, brimful of saving common sense and generous feeling, and profoundly well-read in his own periods and his favourite literature, Macaulay has conferred most memorable services on the readers of English throughout the world. He stands between philosophic historians and the public very much as journals and periodicals stand between the masses and great libraries. Macaulay is a glorified journalist and reviewer, who brings the matured results of scholars to the man in the street in a form that he can remember and enjoy, when he could not make use of a learned book. He performs the office of the ballad-maker or story-teller in an age before books were known or were common. And it is largely due to his influence that the best journals and periodicals of our day are written in a style so clear, so direct, so resonant. We need not imitate his mannerism; we may all learn to be outspoken, lucid, and brisk.

It is the very perfection of his qualities in rousing the interest of the great public which has drawn down on Macaulay the grave rebukes of so many fine judges of the higher historical literature. Cotter Morison, Mark Pattison, Leslie Stephen, and John Morley all agree that his style has none of the subtler charms of the noblest prose, that his conception of history is radically unsound, that, in fact, it broke down by its own unwieldy proportions. Mr. Morison has very justly remarked that if the "History of England" had ever been completed on the same scale for the period intended, it would have run to fifty volumes, and would have occupied one hundred and fifty years. As it is, the eight duodecimo volumes give us the events of sixteen years, from 1685 to 1701; so that the history of England from Alfred would require five hundred similar volumes. Now, Gibbon's eight octavo volumes give us the history of the world for thirteen centuries; that is to say, Gibbon has recounted the history of a century in nearly the same space that Macaulay records the history of a year. There cannot be a doubt that Gibbon's "Decline and Fall" is immeasurably superior to Macaulay's fragment, in thought, in imagination, in form, in all the qualities of permanent history; it stands on a far higher plane; it will long outlast and overshadow it. Compared with this, Macaulay's delightful and brilliant pictures are mere glorified journalism.

Macaulay, who was no braggart, has put it on record that his conception of history was more just than that of Hume, Robertson, Voltaire, and Gibbon. It is perfectly true that his conception was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

different from theirs, his execution was different, and he does not address the same class of readers. But his conception of history was not just; it was a mistake. His leading idea was to make history a true romance. He has accomplished this; and he has given us *a historical novel drawn from authentic documents*. This is, no doubt, a very useful thing to do, a most interesting book to read; it is very pleasant literature, and has a certain teaching of its own to a certain order of readers. But it is not *history*. It sacrifices the breadth of view, the organic life, the philosophy, the grand continuity of human society. It must be a sectional picture of a very limited period in a selected area; it can give us only the external; it inevitably tends to trivial detail and to amusing personalities; it necessarily blinds us to the slow sequence of the ages. Besides this, it explains none of the deeper causes of movement; for, to make a picture, the artist must give us the visible and the obvious. History, in its highest sense, is the record of the evolution of humanity, in whole or in part. To compose a historical novel from documents is to put this object aside. History, said Macaulay in his "Hallam," "is a compound of poetry and philosophy." But in practice, he substituted word-painting for poetry, and anecdote for philosophy. His own delightful and popular "History of England" is a compound of historical romance and biographical memoir.

Macaulay's strong point was in narrative, and in narrative he has been surpassed by hardly any historian and even by few novelists. Scott and Victor Hugo have hardly a scene more stirring than Macaulay's death of Charles II., Monmouth's rebellion, the flight of James II., the trial of Titus Oates, the inner life of William III. This is a very great quality which has deservedly made him popular. And if Macaulay had less philosophy than almost any historian of the smallest pretension, he has a skill in narration that places him in a fair line with the greatest. Unfortunately, this superb genius for narration has rarely been devoted to the grander events and the noblest chiefs in history. Even his hero William III. hardly lives in his canvas with such a glowing light as Charles II., Monmouth, and Jeffreys. The expulsion of James II. was a very poor affair if compared with the story of Charles I. and the Parliament. If Macaulay had painted for us the Council Chamber of Cromwell as he has painted the Whitehall of Charles II.; if he had described the battle of Naseby as well as he has pictured the fight of Sedgemoor; if he had narrated the campaigns of Marlborough as brilliantly as he has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

told that which ended at the Boyne—how much should we have had!

But it could not be. His own conception of history made this impossible. It is well said that he planned his history "on the scale of an ordnance map." He did what a German professor does when he tries to fathom English society by studying the "Times" newspaper day by day. The enormous mass of detail, the infinitesimal minuteness of view, beat him. As he told Johnson, he runs into "big words about little things." Charles' mistress, her pug-dog, the page-boy who tended the dog, nay, the boy's putative father, occupy the foreground: and the poet, the statesman, and the hero retire into the middle distance or the background. What would we have given to have had Macaulay's "History of England" continued down to his own time, the wars of Marlborough, the reign of Anne, the poets, wits, romancers, inventors, reformers, and heroes of the eighteenth century, the careers of Walpole, Chatham, Pitt, Burke, Fox, Nelson, Wellington, Brougham, Bentham, and Canning—the formation of the British Empire—the great revolutionary struggle in Europe. The one thought which dims our enjoyment of this fascinating collection of memoirs, and these veracious historical romances, is the sense of what we might have had, if their author had been a great historian as well as a magnificent literary artist.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOME-LIFE IN INDIA: CHILD-MARRIAGES AND WIDOWS.

DIFFERENT nations have adopted different customs suited to their climate and physical and mental developments. Many things that are good in America are considered barbarous in India. But unhappily for India, though she is the cradle-land of civilization, she has not made the progress which the Western nations have made with the starting capital borrowed from her. The reason is, that India has for a thousand years been the most unfortunate country on the surface of the earth. Owing to the report of her fabulous riches, almost every Western nation in turn has invaded her. Then, again, her religion has kept her progress in check. It is fair to say that if the Western nations had adopted severely religious methods—had really observed Christianity in its original spirit—they would never have made their marvellous progress. During the period when religion had its strongest hold on them, men were burned in Europe for making scientific researches. But as soon as the Europeans liberated themselves from this absorbing devotion to religion, they made progress. The Americans especially are the most progressive nation, and have in some respects left the Europeans behind because they have not been hampered with religion. They have, indeed, found an outlet for their religious fervor in sending missionaries to India, Japan, China, and Africa. I have observed everywhere in the United States that practical men do not permit religion to interfere with their progress. Religious superstition has been the curse of India. Customs, manners, trades, and every-day life are all regulated and dominated by religion. Any habit or custom that once gets religious sanction is very hard to change.

My readers may naturally ask why I dwell upon the subject of religion instead of going on with my proper subject. I wish at the beginning to record my conviction that on the one hand it is not devotion to Christianity that has made the Western nations what they are, and that on the other hand it is devotion to religion that has kept the Hindus back.

To give a fair idea of Hindu women and marriage-customs I must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

go far back to the ancient times and see how and why customs changed. There was a time when the Hindu lady was educated, and when there were no child-marriages. Some of the "Upanishads," speculations on philosophy, were written by ladies. There are books written by ladies also on mathematics and other abstruse subjects. Of course they did not write sensational novels, but they were taught music and dancing: *dancing*, not jumping, hopping, and skipping round a hall in the arms of strangers. There were no child-marriages at that time, and the young lady had liberty to select a husband herself.

There were four kinds of marriage: first, the marriage in which the father gave his daughter to the bridegroom according to religious rites; next, marriage in which the young lady made her own selection; third, marrying by elopement; and last, marrying the bride by force. These two latter were not acknowledged as lawful. In the old books we read that the lady in the princely ranks used to select her husband, and when a daughter came of age, the king appointed a day for the selection of a husband for her, and sent invitations to all the kings and princes. The kings and princes came with their retinues, each wishing to win the fair lady. They met in a very large pavilion, and showed their skill in archery and also their physical power. Then the father or the brother of the lady escorted her to the pavilion and showed her each prince in turn, describing his power and wealth as well as his personal qualifications; and he asked her to select the one that she liked best. The bride then chose whom she liked, and put on his neck a garland of sweet-scented flowers which she carried in her hands. Then the religious part of the marriage was conducted by the Brahmin priests, who were a necessity in all social as well as religious ceremonies. The marriage festival continued for several days, all the princes and kings assembled joining in the rejoicing.

The young princess used to make a vow that she would marry the prince who excelled in aiming an arrow at the mark. A large pot filled with oil was placed in the pavilion, and a fish was hung over it, turning round. The prince who hit the right eye of the fish with the arrow without looking directly at the fish, but at the reflection of it in the oil, was to be the husband of the princess. Owing to this custom, the princes used to practise archery, and they became masters in dexterity. In some cases regular "courting" took place, and there was an exchange of love-letters.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It seems that the system did not prove a good one in the warm climate, where women develop very early, and it was changed, and the giving of the daughter by the father is the prevailing method at present. Especially among the Brahmins did this change from the ancient custom take place. The warrior caste, though they do not follow the ancient custom of allowing their daughters to select their husbands, do not marry them so early as the Brahmins. Some classes follow the Brahmins' custom to the present day, and marry their daughters early.

The Brahmin has to get his daughter married before she attains puberty. This custom has crept into religion. The Hindu religion strictly forbids single life for woman or man: especially must the woman be married. Hence there are no old maids in India. Sometimes one may meet an old "cranky" bachelor, who has remained unmarried because he was too poor to marry, or because his character was not good; but even these are seldom found except in the lower classes. If a man is not married at the latest by his twenty-fifth year, his reputation suffers. It is a belief that those who have a son go to heaven, when the son, after the death of his parents, performs the spiritual rites. However this may be, whether they go to heaven or not, this severe rule tends to a strict cultivation of home-life.

Owing to this rule, if a Brahmin's daughter attains puberty before marriage, the father is disgraced; he loses his caste, and no one will marry the girl. Thus, when a poor man has more than one daughter, it is a misfortune for him. The Hindu father himself has to find out a suitable husband for his daughter, so he goes to a gentleman who has a son. He first makes inquiries about the family, the property, the health and education of the boy. Then he asks the father of the boy to marry his son to his daughter. The father of the boy asks for dowry, and the amount of this is fixed according to the means of the man who asks for it and not of the man who gives it: that is to say, if the father of the boy is very rich, he asks thousands of dollars. Hence the Hindu father of a girl has to spend much for the marriage of his daughter, for he always wishes to see her married into a rich family.

In recent times it has come about that a college education has raised the value of the boy in the marriage-market. If the boy has passed the university examination and has obtained the degree of B. A. or of M. A., the father raises the sum of dowry. He says: "You see, my son has just passed the examination, and many people

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are seeking his hand for their daughters." Hence the boy commands a high price.

In America the young woman selects a husband who can supply all her wants; and let me say that these wants seem to me to be so many that many men do not dare marry. Many women also do not seem to wish to marry because they want men who can spend money for their fancy. Young men look to the hand of a rich man's daughter, and the young woman looks to the hand of the rich man's son,—in other words, they marry the purse of the "old man."

Well, when the Hindu contract is made, the priest (who is an astrologer) is to be consulted as to the tallying of the stars of the boy and the girl. If he says Yes, then the contract is settled, and they proceed to make preparations. Sometimes, if the stars do not agree, the astrologer fixes them all right when he is paid a little money; and this money is generally paid by the bride's father. When all things are settled, the mother of the boy or the nearest relative goes to see the girl and gives her ornaments, and a dinner is given by the girl's father as a promise of marriage. Then the astrologer fixes a day for the marriage. The day is fixed at least a month before the marriage. Then the father of the girl raises a big canopy especially for the marriage ceremony. This costs a great deal of money, for it must be as beautifully adorned as possible, to please the public,—and the public is very critical in such matters. This custom of erecting a big canopy prevails most, even among the poor, on the Malabar coast.

Then the party of the bridegroom comes to the place where the bride lives, and stops in a big house or a temple. The bride's father has to arrange for all this. Sometimes the whole expenses, even the railway fares, are borne by the bride's father; and then the bridegroom's party is often a very large one. The bride's father has to look to the comforts of the whole party. They are to be treated as guests. On the evening of the appointed day, the bridegroom rides on an elephant, or a horse, or in a palanquin, and a long procession is formed. Torches and flower-gardens made of wax and paper are carried by men on their shoulders. Nautch girls dance before the bridegroom. Band music is played, and fireworks are set off. It is a beautiful sight to see this procession. Many carriages filled with children with picturesque dresses lead it. When the procession is at a little distance from the house of the bride, a halt is made, and the bridegroom and all his company sit on cushions and mattresses, waiting for the father of the bride. He also comes with a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

procession, with torches and fireworks, to greet the bridegroom. This greeting is called a "greeting beyond the limits." This ceremony cannot be performed in big cities, but it is observed in small towns. Properly performed, it takes place at the time of the arrival of the bridegroom in the town, but usually, for the sake of convenience, it is performed on the day of the marriage.

The bride's father greets the bridegroom, presents him with a new dress, a cocoanut, and many other things, and returns to his house. Then again the procession moves on. By the side of the bridegroom walks his sister with a silver lamp, and all the ladies lead the procession, the gentlemen following. In some parts of India the ladies sing marriage songs. When the bridegroom comes near the door, the father of the bride again comes to receive him. He presents him a cocoanut and promises to give him his daughter in marriage. This promise is the betrothal. Then he takes the hand of the bridegroom, and escorts him to the seat which is raised in the middle of the canopy, and seats him on it. This raised seat is made beautiful, having small ornamental pillars and a charming arch and a small dome overhead. The whole canopy is illuminated. On the right of the groom sit all the ladies, on the left hand all the gentlemen are seated on cushions. The nautch girls, in two parties, dance before the ladies and gentlemen. The bands play, and when the appointed time arrives (the time of the marriage must be observed to a second, and therefore there is always a great deal of bustle among the ladies to adorn and make the bride ready), the bride is escorted and brought before the bridegroom by her mother and sister. She stands in the presence of the bridegroom, who also stands, and a yellow piece of cloth is held between them. Meanwhile rice (colored red) is distributed in small quantities to all the guests assembled to be ready to throw it on the pair in token of their blessing. When the time arrives, the family priests on both sides repeat three times: "*Su muhurta Sávadhán.*" They address the bridegroom: "This is the good time; be careful henceforward": and all the guests reiterate this and throw the rice at the pair.

Then the yellow cloth is removed, and the bride and bridegroom stand face to face. Then the father of the bride stands near and repeats the Sanskrit sentences which mean: "The bridegroom is not deformed, has not lost caste or has not been polluted, and is healthy. To him I give my daughter in the presence of God, fire, and the priests." The bride's father says: "My daughter is healthy;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she has a brother.[1] She is not of the same family as the bridegroom. This my daughter I give to you. Protect her as her father did."

Then the bridegroom promises: "In religion, in money, conjugal rights, and in salvation I will never leave her." This promise is made three times, and he knows that he now has a wife, and that he must love and take care of her. And he does this sacredly when, later, he lives with her. After this the sacred fire is kindled, and the bridegroom's and the bride's scarfs are tied together with a knot. The bridegroom takes the hand of the bride and walks seven times around the fire. This is called "the seven steps." All the while the priests chant the Vedic *muntras*. There are many minor ceremonies after this, and they continue for four days. On the fourth day the bridegroom takes the bride to his house with the same pomp as when he came for her. The young pair ride together, the wife sitting by his left side. The bride stays there one night with her mother-in-law, and returns to her parents. After some months she is sent back to her husband's house for a few months. While living there she occupies her mother-in-law's or sister-in-law's room. She does not even speak to her husband. The utmost modesty is to be observed by a Hindu woman. She must not talk loudly or giggle and laugh in the streets. The young pair thus religiously married love each other from childhood, and that love becomes stronger when developed and is everlasting.

When the girl becomes of age, another ceremony—the consummation of the marriage—is performed, and then the wife and husband live together.

An impression seems to prevail in Western countries that there is no love between the Hindu wife and husband. The truth is, the Hindu families are the happiest in the world. The Hindu woman, having been tied to the lot of the man early, thinks only of him. His happiness is her happiness. She loves her husband devotedly. In the Western nations I observe that the man works from morning to late in the night to earn money. He has no rest. Who enjoys the benefits of his money? His wife. While he is struggling to get the almighty dollar, his wife is enjoying the luxuries and the leisure it buys. If she cannot get the newest fashion of ornaments or clothing, she is often unhappy, and consequently, if the husband cannot

[1] To have a brother for a girl and a sister for a boy is considered good luck; and this is to show that there is no family defect; in some families no male child is born.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

buy them, he, too, is made unhappy. Moreover, the women in America seem to have greater liberty than the men. The young girl is brought up by her mother to think that she is equal to man and in some respects superior to him. She reads love novels, spends much time at her toilet: she wears in her bonnet flowers, feathers, dead birds, seaweeds, moss, horns, thorns, big needles; and in her dress, pins, hooks, ties, iron and brass bars, clips, stitches, and what not; and on her bosom I have seen her wear a living lizard fastened with a thin chain. Her waist is laced tight by a corset, which makes her pant for breath. Thus equipped, she sallies forth to make conquests of young men's hearts. She seems to me (pardon me, I write without offence) to lack the mild and delicately sweet look that even the commonest Hindu woman has. Her look is bold and defying to the man. This is all owing to the innate feeling that she is equal to the man. In her pride she has forgotten woman's part. There are, of course, many exceptions. But most women in America seem to be—what shall I call it?—"manified." She falls in love (at least she supposes so) with a young man who takes her to the theatre, and whom she finds possessing means enough to buy her dresses of the newest style, and she marries him. I speak of the average woman that I have observed during the year that I have been in the United States. When they love and court, they have a "good time." Why good? Because it is the best time they spend in their lives, for love sometimes ceases after marriage.

If I may speak a moment of one of your institutions, the Western people have no idea, nor can they even imagine, with what abhorrence and shock the Hindus look on divorce. It is the most disgraceful thing for a Hindu to go to court and make any charge against his wife. No woman or man in India, except of the lowest class, would go to the divorce court. It brings disgrace even to the distant relatives; hence there are no divorce cases.

In India the woman is brought up from her childhood in the mildest way possible, and is taught the home duties,—to love her husband and to obey him. Sometimes—I will say in one case out of a million—there is a disagreement, and the wife goes to live with her parents; but such cases are very, very few: I might almost say there is no such case. Of course the widow has not the privilege of remarrying except in the lowest classes. But the man can marry again. I confess that the custom of forbidding the marriage of widows is a heartless custom, yet it has saved us from the scandal of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

divorce cases. In India the man has the better of it; in America the woman has the better. But in India, a quarrel between husband and wife is made up on the evening of the day it occurs. O Western Civilization and Liberty, you drive away the modesty of women wherever you go! You have entered India, and your influence is already felt even there!

The greatest care and anxiety of the Hindu mother is to bring up her daughter to home-life, and to make her a good housewife. When a girl is seven years of age, the mother teaches her to cook and to clean the pots. Hindus have two kinds of washing: one is the daily washing of every-day apparel; for the clothes are changed every morning after bathing. Every Hindu must bathe before he takes his meals. Religion requires that no food be cooked before the person who cooks it has bathed. Hence every woman must bathe before she cooks. A woman first gives a bath to her children; then she takes a bath herself, and thereafter goes to cook. The clothes are changed and washed every day. The little girl washes the smaller clothes on a stone and hangs them for drying. She assists her mother in many small things: she sweeps the kitchen; she fetches the utensils; she cuts and slices vegetables; she pounds and grinds the spices; she takes out the small pebbles from the rice and cleans it in water; and, in short, she does all the petty work, assisting her mother. If she has an infant sister or brother, she feeds it, and lulls it to sleep in the cradle. She gathers flowers and weaves them into wreaths with which the Hindu women adorn their hair. The mother teaches her to sew, and to embroider, and to make her toilet, which is simple. She has no paints on her cheeks and no hooks and thorns in her hair. She adorns her hair with ornamental flowers made of gold. These are fixed on the knot of hair. A small, round mark of red paint is made on her forehead. The absence of this mark from the forehead of a woman indicates that she is a widow, for widows have not the privilege of wearing it. By the time she is fifteen, she learns all things pertaining to general housekeeping and cookery. The mother teaches her to prepare cakes, puddings, and sweetmeats. Hindus, especially Brahmins, cannot eat bazaar-made sweetmeats in which water is mixed. She also teaches her to make preserved pickles and other things for use in the rainy season, which begins at the end of May and lasts to about the middle of October. In short, the mother makes her daughter a good housekeeper before she goes to live with her husband. Often she chides her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

daughter and says: "You will bring discredit on me when you go to your husband's. Your mother-in-law will judge me by your behavior." She is very particular in not allowing her to talk loudly, or to laugh, even at home, at the pitch of her voice, as I have heard American women do even in the streets. Of course "high-caste" American ladies do not laugh in the streets. Yet, as a general rule, it is not considered indecent here as it is in India. I have used the word "caste" because the ladies in America, I observe, have caste prejudices, perhaps quite as strong as in India.

No love songs are taught to a girl. The Hindus do not even sing them in the presence of their women. The girl, after twelve, is not allowed to talk to boys, except to the nearest relatives or family friends, and to these only in the presence of the elders. A young woman cannot go out alone. She is accompanied by an elderly lady, even to the temples and marriage ceremonies. A Hindu lady is not allowed to go to the theatre with other gentlemen than those of her own family; and no Hindu woman—even the poorest, or those of the lowest caste, *not even the dancing girls*—would go on the stage as actresses. Female parts are taken by boys. The Hindus, even the poorest, would not allow their daughters to work in shops or stores and leave them to the mercy of employers. If the parents of a girl are dead, the relatives take care of her until she is married.

The Hindu woman brought up under these strict rules naturally makes a good housewife. When, in turn, she has children, she brings them up in the same way. In the afternoon she talks with her neighbors, mends or sews the clothes, or embroiders, or rests, while her children play. The ladies have their gatherings in India, where they meet and enjoy themselves. Men do not mix in them. At home the Hindu woman has to look to the household duties, and the whole management of the house rests with her. She makes the list of all things required, and the husband or a servant goes and buys them. She does not go shopping.

Of course some of the rules are very strict, but they bring a good result in home-life. Where is a happier home than the Hindu's? The wife loves her husband; the husband loves his wife and children. The Hindu woman's sole desire is to bring happiness into the family, and therefore she is self-denying. Foreigners having no access to Hindu society can have no idea of the bliss of the family life. The members of the family cling to each other. The Hindu feels a family separation with a keenness that Western civilization can hardly appreciate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In India, as long as the parents are alive, the sons, though married and with children of their own, do not separate, but live in the same house and under the command of their parents. Sometimes the mother-in-law is oppressive, but the daughters-in-law, brought up as they are to that life, quietly submit to her. The earnings of all the sons are given to the father, who manages the household. After the father's death, the property is equally divided without reference to the largeness or smallness of the earnings of individuals. Sometimes the brothers also live together with their families. There are thousands of families living together for five or six generations. This patriarchal system is gradually dying away, owing to the progress of Western material civilization.

The hotels and restaurants, to a certain extent, seem, to an observer from a distance, to have spoiled the home-life here in the cities of the United States. Many rich people live in hotels. Ladies, leading their children by the hand, followed by the husband, go to the restaurant and sit at the table like invited guests.

The Hindu woman is as fond of ornaments as the American is of dress. First, the father and the father-in-law give her ornaments at the marriage. Then the husband buys her more, as many as he can. Generally this is the investment of his earnings. These are the savings, and when in need the wife gives him these willingly. The husband, according to law, has no claim on these ornaments. This is the woman's personal property, and the law cannot attach it for the husband's debts. Therefore the husband, as a provision for her after his death, gives her ornaments. This system saves them from being robbed by the bank. Much gold is used in making bangles. Pearls and diamonds are used according to the means of the families. A very poor woman generally has many dollars' worth of gold ornaments, which in time of need are very useful.

But there is one heartless social-religious custom: the widows are not allowed to re-marry. This is a very, very cruel rule, and it has got hardened and fixed by religious sanction. A woman, after her husband's death, is a most pitiable thing. She cannot take part in marriage ceremonies or any others. She must shave her head, and she must not use ornaments. She must live an ascetic life. This is the precept; but all widows do not shave their heads, especially young widows. It is a belief that the soul of the husband cannot enter heaven unless his wife shaves her head! She is the most miserable of creatures. But the impression which prevails in America

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that they are treated badly, is erroneous. The mother and father of the widow look to her with a sigh, and pity her. Sometimes a bad-tempered mother-in-law may treat her badly; but as a general rule she is treated with the utmost sympathy. The ill-treatment of a wife or a widow may occur in the lower classes in any country, but these cases cannot be taken as a criterion.

The Brahmins of the present day feel this very keenly, and the reformers are trying to uproot this cruel custom. Some years ago a law was passed by the government acknowledging the heirship of children born of a widow from her second husband, to his property. Some Brahmins have come forward and boldly introduced widow-marriage. But it is not acknowledged by the orthodox party, which is still very strong and excommunicates the reformers. Yet every year two or three marriages of widows take place among the Brahmins. At first there was a great sensation at such a marriage, but now the fierce outcry against it is dying away. Gradually the Hindus are leaving behind some of their old customs. To unloose the orthodox ideas will take some time, but a day will come when all widows will re-marry. We are fast adopting Western manners—except religion, for the young Brahmin of the present day holds fast to his religion, but he is a very broad-minded man. We are making progress. Thirty or forty years ago, if a Brahmin touched or shook hands with a Christian, he was obliged to take an oath and to change and wash his clothes. Now the Brahmins mix socially with the Christians to a degree. The old orthodox priests and ladies still keep their prejudices, but the liberal party is growing. To touch a beef-eater is polluting. But even this prejudice is dying, except among the ladies and in some remote villages and towns and among the very orthodox.

There are schools for boys and girls in every town and village, established by the government, in which primary education—reading, writing, simple arithmetic, and geography—is taught the boys; and the girls, in addition to the above subjects, are taught cooking, sewing, and embroidery. The girls' schools are separate from the boys'. Generally the teachers in the girls' schools are women; but, where women cannot be had, men take the place. I am sure that a time will come when all our Hindu women will be educated as they were once. They will have liberty, too. Secret love-letters will fly from woman to man; there will be divorces and all the necessary and consequent evils of Western high civilization. But these things will not come with great rapidity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In conclusion, I must request my American readers to pardon my remarks on their social customs. I have felt obliged to speak plainly because erroneous reports seem to have been brought by missionaries, who cannot know the best social life in India. We should not judge one another harshly. I have seen the beautiful home-life of the cultivated Americans. I have been very kindly and very hospitably treated. I have lived as a guest in one family for more than a month, and when I left them I shed tears. I know that there is a genuine and sweet home-life in America, but the tendency is to live in hotels and restaurants. The presence of so many old maids and bachelors, each disliking the other,—these things force me to think none too well of Western methods of bringing up girls. We have no hotels or restaurants in India. Years ago, when I was quite a lad, a relative of mine returned home from Bombay. Among other things, he told us that there were houses where they sold food for money. The village people could not believe it. Cooked food sold! It was a surprise to us. We never took money for feeding people, and never made a business of it. Any traveller was a guest wherever he went. In Sanskrit the word "guest" means "*atithi*," or "one who knows no date." Hence no appointment of date. He can come any time. "*Tithi*" means date, and "*a*" is equal to "*wu*" or "no." But owing to railway and steamship communication and the progress of Western civilization, this custom of hospitality, which is a part of Hindu religion, is also gradually dying away, except in towns. In some big cities there are now "feeding-places"—I cannot call them hotels. We have no equivalent word for such, as we had not the custom of selling food to a stranger. My purpose in telling this is to show that the hotels and restaurants, though very convenient for a traveller, have, together with the manner of bringing up children, especially girls, with too much of independence, injured the home-life of America.

But again, I beg pardon. I am very grateful for the hospitality and kindness that I have received in America during my visit to this grandest nation on the earth. The American ladies surpass their sisters in India in education. It was a very agreeable surprise to me to hear ladies here discussing social, philosophical, and political subjects in a thorough way. In this respect our ladies are far behind them, and I wish that they, too, were educated, as they will again be in time.

PURUSHOTAM RAO TELANG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNIVERSITY TRAINING AND CITIZENSHIP.

It is hard, amidst a multitude of counsellors, to make up our own ideal of what a university should be. We have been so often bidden, by young and old alike, to make our university instruction like that of Germany, that we have more than half consented to try the experiment. And yet we are by no means sure of our purpose in that direction. Once and again we have been made to think a good deal about the advantage that a young fellow gets from reading widely and systematically with a tutor, as the men do at the English universities. We like the close contact between teacher and pupil, and the rather liberal and unscholastic way of handling many books, which such a method of instruction seems to secure. The French system, too, we can appreciate and wish for when we are in the humour. We like the French spirit and sense of form, and we hold our judgments open to suggestions as to the best way of imparting vitality of that sort to our own instruction. All the while, however, it is our temper to put varied and vexatious restrictions on these, as on other, international exchanges. There is a very heavy duty on imported ideals. It costs us more than they are worth to subject them to our customs and get them fairly on the market. There is no great demand for them. The young men who really want them go abroad, if they can, to get them.

And yet we have no university ideal of our own. We are not even sure that we wish to create one. We ask ourselves, Do we want universities of a distinctively American type? It is the first impulse of most scholarly minds to reply with a plain and decided negative. Learning is cosmopolitan, and it would seem at first thought like stripping learning of its freedom and wide prerogative to demand that the universities where it makes its home should be national. Let the common schools smack of the soil, if they must, but not the universities! Must not the higher forms of scholarship follow everywhere the same method, in the same spirit? May not its doctrines constitute always a sort of international law of thought? Is it not a kind of freemasonry which has everywhere like degrees and a com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mon ceremonial? Certainly truth is without geographical boundary, and no one could justly wish to observe a national bias in the determination of it.

It must be remembered, however, that scholarship is something more than an instrument of abstract investigation merely. It is also an instrument and means of life. Nations, as well as individuals, must seek wisdom: the truth that will make them free. There is a learning of purpose as well as a learning of science; for there is a truth of spirit as well as a truth of fact. And scholarship, though it must everywhere seek the truth, may select the truths it shall search for and emphasize. It is this selection that should be national. It is a question of emphasis and point of view; not a question of completing the circle and sum of knowledge. A wise man will choose what to learn; and so also will a wise nation. Not all learning, besides, is without a country. All physical science is international, so are also all formal parts of learning; and all philosophy, too, no doubt, and the laws of reasoning. But there is, besides these, a learning of purpose, to be found in literature and in the study of institutions; and this it is which should be made the means of nationalizing universities, being given the central and coördinating place in their courses of instruction.

In order to be national, a university should have, at the centre of all its training, courses of instruction in that literature which contains the ideals of its race and all the nice proofs and subtle inspirations of the character, spirit, and thought of the nation which it serves; and, besides that, instruction in the history and leading conceptions of those institutions which have served the nation's energies in the preservation of order and the maintenance of just standards of civil virtue and public purpose. These should constitute the common training of all its students, as the only means of schooling their spirits for their common life as citizens. For the rest, they might be free to choose what they would learn. Being thus prepared for their common life together by schooling in the same ideals of life and public action, they might the more safely be left to prepare for their individual and private functions separately and with undisturbed freedom.

It is the object of learning, not only to satisfy the curiosity and perfect the spirits of individual men, but also to advance civilization; and, if it be true that each nation plays its special part in furthering the common advancement, every people should use its universities to perfect it in its proper rôle. A university should be an organ of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

memory for the State for the transmission of its best traditions. Every man sent out from a university should be a man of his nation, as well as a man of his time.

This idea of a balance between general and special training has been temporarily lost sight of by the necessity to make room for the modern scientific studies. We have adopted the principle that a student may freely choose his studies, and so make the most of his natural tastes and aptitudes; and the length we go in applying the principle is determined, it would seem, rather by historical accident than by reasoned policy. If we are conservative, we insist that at least every Bachelor of Arts shall submit to a drill in both Greek and Latin. If we are 'liberal,' we permit the substitution of a modern language for one of these. If we are radical, we give the pupil *carte blanche*, and let him choose for himself what training he will have. But, whether we be conservative, 'liberal,' or radical, we are willing to confer other degrees besides Bachelor of Arts, and, under another label, to send men forth from the university who have taken nothing from it but a drill in laboratories and instruction in the use of tools. We have lost all idea of a common standard of training for all the men alike who seek to be accredited to the world by an academic degree.

Not only so, but in our controversies about the matter we have allowed ourselves to be driven into an awkward and even untenable position. We debate the relative values of a classical training and a scientific, as if it turned wholly upon the question of the development of the individual mind as a good working instrument. Can the man who has received a purely scientific training, from which all the nice discriminations of taste and of delicate judgment that come from the critical study of languages have been left out, use his mind as well as the man who has had these; as well as the man who has been schooled to submit his faculties to the subtle and refining influences of style and syntax, the elevating influences of delicate feeling, and the vivid passion of poet and orator? The question cannot be answered. The one may use his mind quite as well as the other: it depends upon what he uses it for. He uses it differently: that is all. The values represented by the difference cannot be satisfactorily assessed.

The difference is even very difficult to express. But no doubt it can be illustrated. The man who has been trained only in science or in technical and narrow lines—however well equipped or vari-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ously within those lines—is confined to them, not because he lacks knowledge, but because he lacks sympathy and adaptability. The scientific spirit and method, in academic instruction, hold their votaries very rigourously to a single point of view, and the more this spirit and method are submitted to and served, the more restrictive does their mastery become. It is presently impossible for those who are their willing and habituated subjects to understand whereof other men speak when they urge considerations which cannot be subjected to exact tests or modern standards. The men who have been inducted into literature and language, on the other hand, while they have obtained little marketable knowledge, have obtained both drill and an opened view of life. They have, so to say, breathed and analyzed the common air of thought that the better minds have lived in from the first. They have, in greater or less degree, become citizens of the intellectual world, and have examined with some critical care and a little discrimination the documents by which that citizenship is evidenced and secured. They cannot, however, make themselves so immediately useful in the practical tasks of the world of business as the men of the laboratories, the shops, or the purely professional schools; and they are thought, by those who have special training or capacity, to know nothing. They can use their minds, but there is nothing in them to use. They possess, at most, only a point of view. They are like good soils that have been prepared for planting, but as yet contain no edible harvest. The best light of the world has shone upon them; they have been watered by the tears of old songs, quickened by the passion of deeds done long ago; but no merchantable thing has yet been sown in them, and the man of science brings his quick crop first to market.

Certainly we have come to the parting of the ways, and there is nothing for us but to choose a direction. The graduates of our universities no longer go forth with a common training which will enable them to hold together in a community of thought. Some of them are trained in science, some in letters; some well and broadly trained, many ill and narrowly, with a hard technicality and mean contraction of view. Scarcely one of them has been fully inducted into the learning which deals with the common experiences, the common thoughts and struggles, the old triumphs and defeats of the men of his race in the past: their dreams and awakenings; their ambitions, humours, confidences, liberties, and follies: the intimate stuff of their minds and lives in past generations, when others were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in like manner graduated from college and brought face to face with life and the unthinking mass of men.

The study of institutions and of English literature furnishes the only practicable common ground for the various disciplines of the modern university curriculum; but fortunately it has much more to commend it than its practicability. It would furnish also an ideal principle of unity. Such studies are practicable because they are not open to any serious utilitarian objection. They do not involve the long and tedious acquisition of any dead language: their tools are of easy use by any one. They bear directly upon such practical matter as a man's usefulness as a citizen and his influence and acceptability as a member of society. He can understand other men so much the better, command their sympathy the more readily, aid them and obtain their aid the more efficiently, for comprehending affairs and appreciating the common movements of sentiment and purpose. Such a community of plan is ideal because the great spiritual impulses and values which young men get when properly trained in the classics can be gotten in part from the splendid and various literature of our own tongue, rich as it is with treasures both new and old; because men trained to the exact standards and accustomed to the precise measurements of science, its cold dispassionateness and cautious reserve of judgment, can get from that literature an imagination for affairs and the standards by which things invisible and of the spirit are to be assessed; and because the men trained in the classics can get by it their pilotage into the modern world of men and ideas. It makes the classicist more practical and the scientist less narrow and pedantic; it is capable of giving to things technical an horizon and an elevation of spirit, and to things merely scholarly or æsthetic a thrill and ardour and discipline of life.

Every university, therefore, which would educate men as well as drill them, should make the reading of English literature in many sorts and much variety, under energetic and quick-witted tutors, compulsory from entrance to graduation; and the study of institutions under suggestive lecturers compulsory throughout at least the latter half of every course for a degree. It can be done, and sooner or later it must be done, if only to prevent disintegration and the utter separation and segregation of educated men in respect of their ideals of thought and conduct.

But this is the view only from inside the university. The greater arguments, from without, are supplied by the life of the modern

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world and the exigencies of national existence. The world in which we live is troubled by many voices, seeking to proclaim righteousness and judgment to come; but they disturb without instructing us. They cry out upon this point or upon that, but they have no whole doctrine which we can accept and live. They exaggerate, distort, distract. But they are dangerous voices, for all they are so obviously partial and unwise, because we have no clearly conceived standards of common thought to which to hold them. Those who hear are as ignorant and as fanatical as those who speak. A college man who has studied only the classics can no more criticise them than the man who has studied only science or the man who has studied nothing at all. Even the man who has read political economy and history has nowadays, very likely, read no literature. He can only cry out from his corner that these would-be teachers now everywhere on the platform are guilty of errors in logic and misconceptions of historical fact in all their revolutionary talk; and no one cares to listen to his pedantic and scholastic corrections: for these, they say, are matters of life and death, in which we need, not dialectic, but deliverance.

There is no corrective for it all like a wide acquaintance with the best books that men have written, joined with a knowledge of the institutions men have made trial of in the past; and for each nation there is its own record of mental experience and political experiment. Such a record always sobers those who read it. It also steadies the nerves. If all educated men knew it, it would be as if they had had a revelation. They could stand together and govern, with open eyes and the gift of tongues which other men could understand. Here is like wild talk and headlong passion for reform in the past,—here in the books,—with all the motives that underlay the perilous utterance now laid bare: these are not new terrors and excitements. Neither need the wisdom be new, nor the humanity, by which they shall be moderated and turned to righteous ends. There is old experience in these matters, or rather in these states of mind. It is no new thing to have economic problems and dream dreams of romantic and adventurous social reconstruction.

And so it is out of books that we can get our means and our self-possession for a sane and systematic criticism of life: out of our own English books that we can get and appropriate and forever recreate the temper of our own race in dealing with these so hazardous affairs. We shall lose our sense of identity and all advantage of being hard-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

headed Saxons if we become ignorant of our literature, which is so full of action and of thoughts fit for action. We must look to the universities to see to it that we be not denationalized, but rather made more steadfast in our best judgments of progress. To hear the agitators talk, you would suppose that righteousness was young and wisdom but of yesterday. How are the universities correcting the view, and aiding to make this nonsense ridiculous? How many of their graduates know anything clearly to the contrary? How many of them know when to laugh?

Of all things that a university should do for a man, the most important is to put him in possession of the materials for a systematic criticism of life. Our present methods of training may easily enough make *tabula rasa* of a man's mind in respect of such matters. The reasoning of the scientific method, for all but a few constructive minds, is analytical reasoning. It picks things to pieces and examines them in their ultimate elements. It is jealous, if not quite intolerant, of all traditional views; will receive nothing, but test everything; and its influence is very marked and pervasive. It produces, for one thing, an overweening confidence in the pure reasoning faculty. Now, it happens that the pure reasoning faculty, whose only standard is logic and whose only data are put in terms of determinable force, is the worst possible instrument for reforming society. The only thing that makes modern socialism more dangerous than like doctrine has ever been is, that its methods are scientific and that the age also is scientific. Two-thirds of our college graduates are not taught anything that would predispose them against accepting its logic or its purpose to put all things into a laboratory of experiment and arbitrarily recombine the elements of society.

The 'humane' spirit of our time is a very different thing from the *human* spirit. The humanity which we nowadays affect is scientific and pathological. It treats men as specimens, and seeks to subject them to experiment. It cuts cross-sections through the human spirit and calls its description of what is thereby disclosed moral essays and sociological novels. It is self-conscious and without modesty or humour. The human spirit is a very different thing. It has a memory and a sense of humour. It cannot read Ibsen after having read Shakespeare, any more than it can prefer sugar and butter and flour and sweets separately, in their individual intensity, to their toothsome and satisfying combination in pudding. Its literature is that which has the one flavour for every generation, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the same broad and valid sagacity. It regards the scientific method of investigation as one, but only one, method of finding out the truth; and as a method for finding only one kind of truth. It sees the telling points of the socialistic argument, but it knows some old standards of justice that have outlived many programmes of reform and seem still sound enough to outlast these also. "It's a mad world, my masters!" but it takes a nice balance of judgment and a long view of human nature to determine where the madness lies.

The worst possible enemy to society is the man who, with a strong faculty for reasoning and for action, is cut loose in his standards of judgment from the past; and universities which train men to use their minds without carefully establishing the connection of their thought with that of the past, are instruments of social destruction. Of course no man's thought is entirely severed from the past, or ever can be. But it is worth while to remember that science is no older than the present century, and is apt to despise old thought. At least its young votaries are: not because they are 'scientists,' but because they are only scientists. They are as much pedants, in their narrowness, as the men trained exclusively in the classics, whose thought is all in the past.

The training that will bring these two extremes together can be obtained by a thorough familiarity with the masterpieces of English thought and with the efforts of human genius in the field of institutions. A body of men thus made acquainted with their species is needed, to give us, at the centre of our political and social life, a class with definite and elevated ideals and a real capacity for understanding the conditions of progress: a power making for stability and righteousness against the petty and ineffectual turbulence of revolution.

We mistake the service of literature when we regard it as merely æsthetic. A literature of such variety as our own is nothing less than the annals of the best thought of our race upon every topic of life and destiny. Even our poets have had an eye for affairs; their visions have been of men and deeds. And, as for reading in the literature of institutions, no self-governing people can long hold together in order and peace without it. It is noteworthy that what remains the greatest text-book of English law, invaluable in spite of all the modern changes which have been hurried forward in the century since it was written, was written for laymen. Blackstone intended his lectures for the gentlemen of England: to enable the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men of Oxford to take a place of intelligent authority in society when they should come into their own. With the spirit of our sane literature in us, and the strong flavour of our institutional principles present in all that we do or attempt, we shall be broad men enough, be our special training, in tools or books, what it may. Without this, we can but go astray alike in our private judgments and our public functions.

It would not be necessary to erect a new university to try the experiment of such a synthesis of university courses; though that would be worth doing, were the means made sufficient for a really great object-lesson in the right motives of education. Anybody can establish the modern sort of university, anywhere. It has no necessary nationality or character. But only in a free country, with great traditions of enlightened sentiment and continuous purpose, can a university have the national mark and distinction of a deliberate espousal of the spirit of a noble literature and historic institutions. Such a university would be a National Academy,—the only sort worth having. The thing can be done, however, without troubling a millionaire to appropriate to himself the glory of a unique function of greatness in the development of education. It can be done by only a comparatively slight readjustment of subjects and instructors in the greater of the universities we already have. It can even be done upon no mean scale by every college whose resources are at all adequate to the ordinary demands of education.

It may be made the basis for the synthesis now so sadly lacking in university plans. Better than any other discipline, it can be made the meeting point for all degrees: where candidates in every sort may get their liberalizing outlook upon the world of thought and affairs. More worthily than any other can it be made the means of nationalizing the men whom the universities send forth to represent the power and worth of education. In no better way can an American university obtain a distinguishing function in the world.

As a practical means of university reorganization, such a plan would sacrifice nothing of our present academic freedom. The study of the literature and institutions of our stock could be made the common feature of all the schools of a modern university without cutting off any essential part of the separate groups of studies we have been at such pains to develop. It would not prevent, or even embarrass, specialization. It is susceptible of being joined alike to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

classical studies and to technical training; and it would not be incongruously joined to either. It would serve ideally, besides, as the centre of those compromise and middle courses of study, half way between the classical and the scientific, which the peculiar conditions of the day have constrained the colleges to offer. It would make all courses in a good sense 'liberal' without requiring any wholesale reconsideration of the provisions we have already made to train men for the special tasks of practical life.

The serious practical question is, How are all the men of a university to be made to read English literature widely and intelligently, as this plan presupposes? For it is reading, not set lectures, that will prepare a soil for culture: the inside of books, and not talk about them; though there must be the latter also, to serve as a chart and guide to the reading. The difficulty is not in reality very great. A considerable number of young tutors, serving their novitiate for full university appointments, might easily enough effect an organization of the men that would secure the reading. Taking them in groups of manageable numbers, suggesting the reading of each group, and by frequent interviews and quizzes seeing that it was actually done, explaining and stimulating as best they might by the way, they could not only get the required tasks performed, but relieve them of the hateful appearance of being tasks, and cheer and enrich the whole life of the university.

WOODROW WILSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PROFIT-SHARING LABOR UNIONS OF ANTWERP.

So general is the idea among laborers that they will be persecuted by their employers unless they are sheltered under the folds of a "union," that an instance of employees organizing for the advancement of the interests of their employers is unique enough to deserve the consideration of the thoughtful as well as the attention of the curious. In the European countries where conditions have become fixed by custom and changes are restricted by the oversupply of labor, strikes fail because of the lack of moral support accorded the strikers or the eagerness with which several unemployed men would grasp at every vacated place; and a boycott is practically made inefficient by the large number of persons engaged in a small way in all the trades and industries. This feeling of helplessness on the part of the laborers one would think might naturally prompt silent if not open defiance, and the desire to promote the welfare of the employer would be foreign to the mind of the employee. Still this wish seems to have prevailed at Antwerp—one of the oldest of the busy places of Europe—in the establishment there of those guilds or societies known as the "nations."

By the enactment of laws favorable to the free importation of foreign wares, Antwerp early in the fifteenth century became an important port, as can be learned from the reports of the embassies sent by various courts to attend the regal festivities which frequently took place there. But the delays in discharging vessels and the frequent losses to merchandise from unskilful handling threatened to outweigh beneficent legislation and advantageous position. The dock-hands and porters became careless, in the belief that plenty of work would always await them; but an awakening came when some of the united traders erected buildings of their own, where they could not only store their goods but house their workmen and horses as well. Two of these structures are still standing—the "Maison Hanséatique" and the "Maison de Hesse." The result of the awaking of the laborers to a proper apprehension of the danger of the loss of work, and the consciousness that sooner or later it would fall into the hands of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strangers, was the establishment in 1442 of a company of 'longshoremen who assumed the name "Les Grecs," a name which, with merely those changes incident to change of language, the society has borne from that year to the present time. This was the first of the fifty "nations" now in active existence at Antwerp.

A "nation" is a corporation of workmen forming a limited society in which every member is also a stockholder. The society is not only limited in membership, but it is restricted also in functions. First of all, the "nations" work only at the docks, loading or unloading vessels or hauling merchandise to or from ships; secondly, each "nation" will handle only certain articles of commerce, and again, only those articles which come from or are destined for a certain port. For example, the "Katven nation" will unload wool that comes from Buenos Ayres, but a vessel charged with wool from Australia can secure the services only of the "Zuid nation." One "nation" puts on board ordinary Belgian sugar; but if the sugar is specially refined and intended for candy, its loading is the work of another "nation." The underlying principle of this elaborate differentiation of labor is that a society with restricted lines of work can become especially proficient in those lines, can acquire the best implements and appliances for their performance, and thus give to their employers the best possible service. In no instance has this monopoly given an excuse for extortionate charges or forcible increase of prices.

Every one of these societies upon its organization must give bond to abide by the regulations prepared by the port officers, and a special rule fixes for a term of years—usually ten—the tariff of charges, and any attempt to violate this rule would result in an immediate abrogation of the society's privileges. On the other hand, every vessel entering port is obliged to employ the appropriate society; but this compulsion is evidently in the best interests of shippers, as can be seen from what follows as well as from the fact that the maritime trade of Antwerp is increasing at the rate of one hundred thousand tons per year. Every "nation" is a stock company, but no one can hold stock who is not an active working member. As a member he obeys implicitly the orders of his superiors and profits by his own labors as well as by the labors of his associates.

The officers are a dean and as many assistant deans as may be necessary,—there being one dean in the smaller societies of twenty or thirty members, and two or three in those of fifty or sixty,—and a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

secretary and such additional officers as are found essential in each society. They are elected annually and are eligible for re-election, but serve without extra compensation. Every organization has its own by-laws; but since they are not published, and dismissal would be the penalty of their promulgation, very little is known about them. The "nations," however, appear to be very wisely governed regarding the duties and obligations of the members to one another; for it is known that fines are imposed for certain offences. For instance, if a member fails to report each morning, unless sick, he pays eighty cents; if the absence occurs twice within a month the fine is two dollars; while the next repetition would result in dismissal. Again, if one member summons another, against his will, as a witness, he must pay an honorarium of four dollars for every day, and the same amount is demanded in case one member causes the arrest of a colleague.

The nearest approach to an authentic financial statement is obtained from the decennial report which each "nation" must submit to the local authorities showing its nominal assets and liabilities. From the accounts rendered in 1890 it is seen that the richest "nation" had a capital of $180,000, divided into shares of $5,000 each; and the next richest had a capital of $168,000, divided into shares of $4,000. Of the actual assets the world at large knows nothing, except that they consist of a number of magnificent draught-horses (perhaps the best in the world), wagons, stables, and such appliances as are needed in their work. The Belgian law requiring every firm and corporation to file a balance-sheet annually does not apply to the "nations," because they have no standing in the local courts. In their articles of incorporation they bind themselves to submit all differences between themselves and their employers to arbitration. Yielding their right to sue, they become exempt from being sued.

The outward workings of a "nation" resemble somewhat a patriarchal form of government. On every work-day morning all the members who are able assemble at headquarters half an hour before time to begin work, and receive assignments for the day. This allotment of tasks is made by the dean and is not subject to open criticism or refusal, but he is doubtless guided by a knowledge of every man's special fitness or some consideration of his recent labors. Those for whom there is no work have the day free without suffering any diminution in their share of the society's profits, but they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are not allowed to hire themselves to others, the idea being that they keep themselves fresh for the probable duties of the morrow. In the evening, those who were occupied report at the office, and a record is made by the secretary of the place and of the character of the work, rather as a check upon the work than upon the workmen. When the task is finished the dean collects the entire amount due the society and places it in bank as a part of the general fund. At the end of the month the net receipts are equally divided among the members, regardless of the number of idle or employed days of each. Usually there is a maximum limit to the sum paid to each member for his share of the month's profits; that is to say, if the receipts would justify a larger dividend he would receive only $80, the overplus remaining in the general fund to help over those months when the earnings are less. Likewise those who are unable to work because of sickness or injury received in the discharge of duty fare equally with the others. This benefit, however, is restricted to a definite number of months, usually four.

The "nations" sustain individually—or collectively in some cases—orphan asylums for the maintenance of the children of those who die from illness contracted or injury received while engaged at work. As the number of accidents is large and the lives of men engaged in such heavy work is short, these institutions are always well filled. The city, rightly appreciating the contributions that the "nations" make to the mercantile prosperity of Antwerp, assist in the support of these asylums or in educating their occupants.

When a member dies his share is sold at auction for the benefit of his heirs. Shares in the more prosperous nations command a premium, according to the condition of the society. In this sale no preference is shown a son of the deceased should he be a bidder. Since no member can own more than one share, there is always an evenly distributed power with no possibility for control on the part of any one except through the weight of personal influence. And as each member is also a shareholder, when he looks after his own interests by assiduous and well-directed labor, he is contributing to the welfare of all. With the increase of work they do not add to their membership and thereby risk a loss or at least a depreciation in the value of their stock in case of any untoward movement in trade, but they employ laborers, thus becoming themselves employers, or rather contractors. Those "nations" that also load vessels have their own

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expert stevedores, as well as their own blacksmiths and wagon-makers; but in no case are these members.

When a vessel passes Flushing, a telegraphic message is sent to the port-officer at Antwerp, giving the approximate size of the ship and the character of her cargo. A place at the dock is at once assigned to the ship, and the appropriate "nation" is notified, so that by the time she takes her place at the dock the men are ready to take her in hand. As soon as the first member of the "nation" places his hand upon the cargo, the whole "nation" becomes responsible for it, as well as for any damage that the ship may sustain through careless discharging. Thus it is that the largest vessel as well as the tiniest craft can confidently ascend the Scheldt knowing that no delays await her because of strikes or useless bargaining for reduced rates. It is this confidence together with other exceptional facilities that is making Antwerp the first maritime city on the continent of Europe and enables her to handle fourteen thousand tons of merchandise every day.

J. H. Gore.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW TO BRING WORK AND WORKERS TOGETHER.

THE other day a man, a German house-painter, committed suicide in West Forty-ninth Street, New York. I suppose that it is not very often that the readers of THE FORUM are asked to concern themselves about an ordinary, every-day suicide; for I may as well say at once that this one had nothing to redeem it from the reproach of being hopelessly common. Suicides belong in the category of crime, which the newspapers are blamed for exploiting *ad nauseam*. I am not at all sure that that view is correct, or justified even by the sensational stories that are published. Suicides sometimes preach sermons to which society, to its injury, turns a deaf ear. Any wrong unredressed works injury to society, and back of a good many suicides there is somewhere wrong—injustice. That the wrong was unintentional, the result perhaps of twisted, unnatural conditions for which no one was directly or wholly responsible, makes it only the more important that we should see the truth and know what causes produce such effects.

This suicide that I speak of was a case in point. The little family now broken up lived happily enough until the man lost his job last fall and failed to find another. From that time on troubles crowded upon them. Worry laid him upon a sick-bed from which he did not rise until the winter was far spent. What little they had saved against a rainy day was then long since gone. The wife had to go out washing to earn bread for them all. Happily she was strong and cheerful. But her husband, not so light-hearted, suffered at the sight and at his inability to help. As the days of his convalescence passed and he went about again, he sought work with the desperation of a man whose life was at stake. And it was. Worn out in body and mind by the hopelessness of his search, he broke down under the last disappointment and killed himself. He said to his wife before he died that he could no longer bear to see her work as she did, when he was unable to help her.

That was his story, and there was no reason for doubting it,—certainly not because of its strangeness. There were more cases of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that kind last winter and in other winters that have gone before. There are thousands looking as anxiously and as vainly for work as he, even to-day. But the feature in his case to which I invite attention is that the work had been looking persistently and vainly for him all the time. The job wanted him quite as badly as he wanted the job. They simply had not found each other. *There was no place where they would naturally both go in search of what each wanted.* And so the job to-day is not done, and the man is dead, a suicide.

How do I know this? Because I had the job to give. I had been searching for a painter of just his kind many weeks and had not found him. I had a reason for searching which makes me write down the story of it here. I have a little house out on Long Island that needed painting. It needs that periodically. Two years ago, or three, when it was in that state last, it happened that all the painters in my neighborhood were busy. I went three or four weeks vainly trying to get one, and then one day my business as a police reporter led me to a tenement on the west side of New York where a house-painter had that day killed himself because he could not find work. There was no other cause. He was neither a drunkard nor an idler. He simply was unable to find work by which to support his family. That very day I had tried hard to hire the services of just such a man as he, but I could not. I made up my mind then that, when next I needed a painter, I should look for a man in his plight. If there was one, I had no doubt that I should find him.

More than a month ago, my house being in need of painting again, I set about the quest. I inquired here and I inquired there, of this charity committee and of that, but did not find what I wanted. I had almost concluded that all the city painters were at work, and, being unable to wait longer, I sent for one of the village workmen. I left him that morning at work, to find upon my arrival at the office the story of this second painter's suicide.

It was a coincidence, of course; but such coincidences are not meaningless. The meaning of this one was plain. Had there been such a place as I spoke of, where the man and the job would naturally go in search of each other with mutual confidence, these two lives would not have been wasted. For suicide, apart from its moral aspect, is waste; and this was wicked waste, seeing how badly the lives so recklessly thrown away were needed scarce half a dozen miles away. There was a failure here of the social machinery which surely required adjustment.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The way of adjustment was as clearly indicated as the need of it. I pointed out in THE FORUM at the time of the first painter's suicide that one great need of the poor in New York was a thoroughly representative, really adequate labor bureau, where what there was of work in bad seasons could be made to go as far as it would. It does not do so now. We have employment bureaus, but I would have an employment bureau to which everybody would come as a matter of course, feeling perfectly sure that whether he wanted work or workmen, if they were to be had he would get them there. We have as a legacy from the last hard winter, the Charity Pawnshop and the Wayfarers' Lodge, excellent in their way; but they are both at the wasteful end of the problem how to deal with poverty; and so are most other ways charity has devised. The ounce of prevention, always so precious, would be the Employment Bureau. Why have we not one?

I do not mean a municipal enterprise. I would rather have none. Neither do I mean a money-making or newspaper-advertising scheme, nor yet a charity with the charity sticking out all over it, but a friendly, capable, aggressive concern that should really endeavor to cover the field, to inform itself about the labor market in town and out of town, and make such tragic blunders as these I have mentioned impossible.

Relief committees are well enough for an emergency, but they make no pretence to the kind of grasp of the situation that I speak of. They speedily feel the want of it. As to the employment bureaus that exist—I mean those that are in the field to benefit mankind, not to make money—I have no desire to discredit them; but I maintain that they are miserably inadequate. They content themselves mostly with registering applicants. As well might a general hope to overwhelm the enemy with his morning roll-call—very imposing, no doubt, and satisfying, but hardly substantial enough for a fight. The labor unions' offices are perhaps an exception, but they cover only so much of the field as has been reached by organization, and that is neither the bigger nor the needier end of it.

In what way could such a bureau be launched with the best promise of success? Why not, by the way, call it a "labor exchange" rather than "bureau"? All trades and branches of business have their exchanges where the exact state of the market for their special wares here and abroad can be ascertained at any time. The only market that is without official quotation or attention of that sort is the most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

important of all, the labor market, though upon its state depends the well-being of the whole community. It is left to balance itself somehow, and it does after a fashion. What that fashion is I have had occasion to observe since I have lived out on Long Island. There has been no spring these eight years past, and I presume not before them in the memory of man, that has not found us suffering for help to dig our gardens and to mow our lawns. We have had work for twenty men whom we could not get, and yet in the city, only eight miles away, a hundred times twenty able-bodied men were at that time walking the streets begging for work, with no one to direct them to us. I am not thinking of tramps—there are always enough of them—but of men who wanted work and wanted it badly.

But about the way of establishing the exchange that shall bring the two together. Two ways are open: by private means, or by public provision. If the latter, it must needs be a State concern; as municipal action is neither desirable nor in the least probable. It is not desirable, because politics would be too apt to get mixed up with it, and because it would not be likely to reach far enough, in which case it would be merely the old failure on a larger scale. Against the danger of politics, the State's authority is not sure protection; but on the other hand it furnishes the only guarantee that the bureau would be planned on a really useful scale. The State has now in its labor statistics and the machinery by which they are collected the very material for such a bureau, without which it would be a mere registry office of no value.

In any event a private concern would need some sort of connection with these State offices as a means of informing itself of the situation. It is to be noted also that a State bureau would have the support and co-operation of organized labor, which might be wanting in any other case. The labor organizations championed a State employment bureau in the last New York legislature. These considerations weigh against any supposed socialistic tendencies in action by the State. For that matter, why should there be more socialism in a State employment bureau than in a State bureau of labor statistics? And may not one with perfect consistency deny the claim that the State is bound to furnish work for its unemployed, and yet applaud its efforts to help its starving citizens to help themselves? That is all the employment office would do for them, and on economic grounds it might well be considered good politics.

The "Ohio experiment," as it was called, is instructive on that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point. In April, 1890, the State of Ohio, under pressure of the labor organizations, established by law free employment offices in the five cities of Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, and Toledo. They were made a part of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The superintendents were to report weekly to the commissioner in charge, and they were to exchange lists of "help wanted" and "situations sought" with each other. There was some delay through a provision in the law which settled the expenses of the offices on the cities in which they were; but, despite this, the first six months made the following showing: Applicants for work numbered 20,136, a little over one-third of them women. Employers had registered a demand for 18,154 persons—somewhat more than half women. Nearly fifty per cent found what they wanted. The total number who secured situations through the offices was 8,982, of which number 5,575 were males, and 3,407 females. The entire cost of conducting all the offices was less than $5,000.

"If," says the commissioner in his report, "the 8,982 persons who secured work through the free public employment office had obtained it through the private employment agencies, it is fair to assume that the cost of such services would have averaged $3 per capita for males, and $1 for females, or a total of $20,132; and by deducting from the latter sum the cost of maintaining the free public employment offices, there is a balance of $15,132, which has been saved to the willing yet poor and needy working men and women by the State law."

From the above figures it would appear that domestic servants and those looking for such help made immediate use of the offices. And so, in fact, the superintendent of the Cleveland bureau reports in the following year (1891): "Persons employing females for domestic service have nothing but the highest praise for the office." Not so the private intelligence offices, whose fraudulent practices the officials had denounced from the outset. The fight with these was in full swing, but it did not last long. Already in 1892 they had been cleared out entirely from three of the five cities. Only in Cleveland and in Cincinnati a few yet survived.

In the second year of the experiment the free employment offices found work for four out of every nine applicants, and for every four vacancies there were five to fill them. After two and a half years, on January 1, 1893, the commissioner reports the plan as having passed the experimental stage. On business as well as on humane grounds he pronounces it a success. A total of 81,464 had applied for work, and 63,564 for "help." In 38,352 cases these demands had been made to fit each other. The National Convention of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Officials of Bureaus of Labor Statistics, held in Denver in May, 1892, recommended the plan for consideration to their respective State governments.

Two things are especially noticeable in this statement. One is the strikingly large percentage of employers demanding help, with so many seeking work. In 1890 the "help wanted" was 90.2 per cent of the "situations wanted." In 1891, which was a bad year with a great dearth of work, it was yet 67.52 per cent of the "situations wanted," while 45.2 per cent of the latter secured the coveted work. In 1892 the registered demand for help footed up 82.36 per cent of the requests for work. Nothing further need be said in justification of the experiment. It is the story of my painters over again. The other thing that arrested my attention was this, that in less than two years the bureau had run into a rut, out of which it had to be pulled by the removal of all the five superintendents on account of "lack of interest and enthusiasm." That was evidently the political end of it; but as their chief, the commissioner, had himself been changed in the interval, I shall not say upon whom politics fell heaviest. It is worth noticing, however, that it was there.

The Ohio experiment is likely to be urged upon other legislatures this coming winter, among them that of New York. The labor men proposed it last year at Albany, but it was then ignored. Whatever be the result at the next session, it is worthy of the most serious discussion. Something of the sort should be started in New York city at all events. It may be that it will be left to private benevolence to take the first step. In that case two conditions are to be insisted upon in advance: that the movement shall inspire confidence from the start, and that the benefits it would confer shall be entirely free. All the rest may be left to work itself out as the plan develops. But at the start it should gather to its support all the best elements in the community. In fact it should partake of the character of a citizens' movement for a great emergency. The emergency is quite certain to be great enough both to warrant and to demand it, and to a greater or less extent it will always exist in New York city.

Some years ago the Society for Improving the Condition of the Poor, if I am not mistaken, saw the need of such a bureau and discussed a plan to start one. Why it was shelved I do not know. The Society is one which might well take the initiative in an undenominational movement of that sort by inviting kindred organizations

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to join. The East Side Relief Committee is another. The point is that it should possess the fullest confidence of the public. I am certain that there is no way in which the condition of the worthy poor could be improved more readily and effectively. Tramps would not obstruct it. They would give the employment bureau a wide berth. I can see no objection to it, and no hindrance save the red tape that would inevitably spin itself out of such an organization and would have to be kept down to the useful point. But I can see great good to come from it. It would enormously simplify the work of the Relief Committee, which we shall need again, and in fact render much of it unnecessary. The soup-house would be finally and happily eliminated from our winter landscape, and the pauperization avoided that is the sad legacy of the best-meant efforts in behalf of the needy.

Who knows what effect the better understanding of the labor market which such an Employment Exchange would help to bring about might have in preventing the ignorant strikes that add so much to the undeserved suffering of the great body of workers who have nothing? With half of those seeking relief really wanting work, as is always the case, and with work going begging around the corner, as happens often enough to demonstrate that the whole business is a huge misfit, it seems to me that an employment bureau of the kind I have described is not only a logical necessity, but concrete Christianity and common sense rolled into one.

JACOB A. RIIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED